

of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from

areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

CONCLUSION

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.

Jeannie Layson /EAC/GOV

11/28/2006 10:27 AM

To EAC Personnel

cc

bcc

Subject FOIA Request

Hello everyone,

I need each of you to respond affirmatively or negatively to the FOIA request below. **If you have no documents in your possession related to this request , please reply to me with the words "no records."** If you have records, please identify them in an e-mail reply and attach them to the e-mail. If the document is not electronic, hand deliver them to me. Also, if you believe any of these related documents should be withheld, please provide a brief memo stating the reason for your position.

I need this information and/or a response by **COB December 5, 2006**. If you cannot comply by this date, please provide notification and an estimated time when you will provide the information and the reason why you cannot comply by the original deadline. Thanks for your cooperation. See request below:

Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center for Justice has submitted a FOIA request for the voting fraud report prepared by our consultants and the voter ID report, as well as the following information:

"In the event that the EAC denies my renewed request for the voter ID and voting fraud reports or delays another week in providing those materials, we respectfully request copies of (1) all requests for proposals and contracts relating to the voter ID and voting fraud reports; and (2) all written and electronic communications concerning the voter ID and voting fraud reports between the EAC and (a) the Eagleton Institute of Politics, (b) the Moritz College of Law, (c) Tova Wang, (d) Job Serebrov, and (e) any other individuals or entities, including but not limited to outside reviewers."

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the FOIA request.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

014880

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
11/29/2006 05:35 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC, "Davidson, Donetta"
<ddavidson@eac.gov>, Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC, Margaret
Sims/EAC/GOV@EAC
bcc

Subject Revised - Draft -- Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Report

Attached is a revised version of the Voting Fraud/Voter Intimidation Draft Report. The changes that Commissioner Hillman suggested have been made and highlighted in yellow. See pages 10-11.

Peggy and I are working on the revision of the Donsanto and Tanner interview summaries and will forward that to you under a separate email.



Voter Fraud & Intimidation Report - 112906.doc

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

014891

EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY**INTRODUCTION**

Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, they mean different things to different people. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the lawful application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of these topics has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voting fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a working definition of election crimes and adopted research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in the United States.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are topics that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voting fraud and voter intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. The initial study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voting fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voting fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voting fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang,¹ who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. The consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and the need to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged with (1) researching the current state of information on the topic of voting fraud and voter intimidation; (2) developing a uniform definition of voting

¹ Biographies for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, the two consultants hired by EAC, are attached as Appendix "1".

fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) proposing recommended strategies for researching this subject.

EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voting fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

The Honorable Todd Rokita

Indiana Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board and the
Executive Board of the Standards Board

Kathy Rogers

Georgia Director of Elections, Office of
the Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board

J.R. Perez

Guadalupe County Elections
Administrator, Texas

Barbara Arnwine

Executive Director, Lawyers Committee
for Civil Rights under Law
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

Benjamin L. Ginsberg

Partner, Patton Boggs LLP
Counsel to National Republican
Campaign Committees and Republican
candidates

Robert Bauer

Chair of the Political Law Practice at the
law firm of Perkins Coie, District of
Columbia
National Counsel for Voter Protection,
Democratic National Committee

Mark (Thor) Hearne II

Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St
Louis, Missouri
National Counsel to the American
Center for Voting Rights

Barry Weinberg

Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief,
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division,
U.S. Department of Justice

Technical Advisor:

Craig Donsanto

Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S.
Department of Justice

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.

EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

To begin our study of voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books. There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voting fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted and reports published about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “2”:

Articles and Reports

- People for the American Way and the NAACP, “The Long Shadow of Jim Crow,” December 6, 2004.
- Laughlin McDonald, “The New Poll Tax,” *The American Prospect* vol. 13 no. 23, December 30, 2002.
- Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau, “An Evaluation: Voter Registration Elections Board” Report 05-12, September, 2005.
- Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Attorney’s Office “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” May 10, 2005.
- National Commission on Federal Election Reform, “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” Center for Democracy and Election Management, American University, September 2005.
- The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, Commissioner and Law Professor at George Washington University School of Law “Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform,” September 19, 2005.

- Chandler Davidson, Tanya Dunlap, Gale Kenny, and Benjamin Wise, “Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – or Both?” A Report to the Center for Voting Rights & Protection, September, 2004.
- Alec Ewald, “A Crazy Quilt of Tiny Pieces: State and Local Administration of American Criminal Disenfranchisement Law,” The Sentencing Project, November 2005.
- American Center for Voting Rights “Vote Fraud, Intimidation and Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election,” August 2, 2005.
- The Advancement Project, “America’s Modern Poll Tax: How Structural Disenfranchisement Erodes Democracy” November 7, 2001
- The Brennan Center and Professor Michael McDonald “Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voting fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General,” The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, December 2005.
- Democratic National Committee, “Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio,” DNC Services Corporation, 2005
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."
- Craig Donsanto, "The Federal Crime of Election Fraud," Public Integrity Section, Department of Justice, prepared for Democracy.Ru, n.d., at http://www.democracy.ru/english/library/international/eng_1999-11.html
- People for the American Way, Election Protection 2004, Election Protection Coalition, at <http://www.electionprotection2004.org/edaynews.htm>
- Craig Donsanto, "Prosecution of Electoral Fraud under United State Federal Law," *IFES Political Finance White Paper Series*, IFES, 2006.

- General Accounting Office, "Elections: Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote," Report to Congressional Requesters, September 2005.
- Lori Minnite and David Callahan, "Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud," Demos: A Network of Ideas and Action, 2003.
- People for the American Way, NAACP, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," December 2004.

Books

- John Fund, *Stealing Elections: How Voting fraud Threatens Our Democracy*, Encounter Books, 2004.
- Andrew Gumbel, *Steal this Vote: Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in American*, Nation Books, 2005.
- Tracy Campbell, *Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, An American Political Tradition – 1742-2004*, Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2005.
- David E. Johnson and Jonny R. Johnson, *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the White House: Foolhardiness, Folly, and Fraud in the Presidential Elections, from Andrew Jackson to George W. Bush*, Taylor Trade Publishing, 2004.
- Mark Crispin Miller, *Fooled Again*, Basic Books, 2005.

During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive, nationwide study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voting fraud or voter intimidation in the United States. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voting fraud or voter intimidation. For example, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection program during the 2004 Presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as

“Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, including legal practices that allegedly cause vote suppression.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by nongovernmental groups create opportunities for fraud. For example, a number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of persons affiliated with a certain political party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

Interviews with Experts

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voting fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

Wade Henderson
Executive Director,
Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

Wendy Weiser
Deputy Director,
Democracy Program, The Brennan
Center

William Groth
Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana
voter identification litigation

Lori Minnite
Barnard College, Columbia University

Neil Bradley
ACLU Voting Rights Project

Pat Rogers
Attorney, New Mexico

Nina Perales
Counsel,
Mexican American Legal Defense and
Education Fund

Rebecca Vigil-Giron
Secretary of State, New Mexico

Sarah Ball Johnson
Executive Director,
State Board of Elections, Kentucky

Stephen Ansolobohere
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Chandler Davidson
Rice University

Tracey Campbell

Author, *Deliver the Vote*

Douglas Webber

Assistant Attorney General, Indiana

Heather Dawn Thompson

Director of Government Relations,
National Congress of American Indians

Jason Torchinsky

Assistant General Counsel,
American Center for Voting Rights

Robin DeJarnette

Executive Director,
American Center for Voting Rights

Harry Van Sickle

Commissioner of Elections,
Pennsylvania

Tony Sirvello

Executive Director
International Association of Clerks,
Recorders, Election Officials and
Treasurers

Joseph Sandler

Counsel
Democratic National Committee

John Ravitz

Executive Director
New York City Board of Elections

Sharon Priest

Former Secretary of State, Arkansas

Kevin Kennedy

Executive Director
State Board of Elections, Wisconsin

Evelyn Stratton

Justice
Supreme Court of Ohio

Joseph Rich

Former Director
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Craig Donsanto

Director, Public Integrity Section
U.S. Department of Justice

John Tanner

Director
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice

These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by nongovernmental groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it is the most likely type of fraud to be discovered, there are stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud, and it is an inefficient method of influencing an election.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws,

voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voting fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states, enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state's attorney general. Regardless, voting fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute election crimes perpetrated in elections with a federal candidate on the ballot or perpetrated by a public official under the color of law. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement. Some allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive. Others feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix "3".

Case Law and Statutes

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from courts of appeal. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix "4".

Media Reports

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voting fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters on voter registration list and/or voting,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,

- non-citizens voting,
- vote buying,
- deceptive practices, and
- fraud by election officials.

While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voting fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a “battleground” or “swing” state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voting fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charges and prosecutions of voting fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voting fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future. As a result, EAC has adopted the use of the term “election crimes” for its future study.

Current Terminology

The phrase “voting fraud” is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. “Fraud” is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

Fraud, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu[ally] a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.

Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 685.

“Voting” is the act of casting votes to decide an issue or contest. Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of “voting fraud,” it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed to influence the act of voting.

Thus, a voter who intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to vote for that person would be committing “voting fraud.” Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter’s polling place commits fraud on the voter.

The phrase “voting fraud” does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not related to the act of voting and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, “voting fraud” does not capture actions or willful inaction in the voter registration process. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the act of voting nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

New Terminology

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” that would serve as the basis for a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. Because the current terminology has such a variety of applications and meanings, “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” can be read to encompass almost any bad act associated with an election. Such broad terminology is not useful in setting the boundaries of a future study. A definition must set parameters for future study by applying limitations on what is included in the concepts to be studied. The current terminology applies no such limitations.

Thus, EAC has adopted the use of the phrase “election crimes” to limit the scope of its future study. This term captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes and excludes civil wrongs and non-election related crimes. EAC adopted this definition because it better represents the spectrum of activities that we are able to and desire to study. In addition, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study all “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation,” including criminal acts, civil actions, as well as allegations of voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. Finally, by limiting this definition to criminal acts, EAC can focus its study on a set of more readily measurable data. Criminal behavior is readily defined through state and federal statutes and is prosecuted by government agencies. This is not the case with civil matters. Civil actions can be prosecuted by individuals and/or government entities. Furthermore, what constitutes civil action is far less defined, subject to change, and can vary from case to

case. A more complete discussion of the concept of “election crimes” follows along with a list of excluded actions.

The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.

The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or on election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.

The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

Acts of Deception

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter’s precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making or knowingly possessing a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate in one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;

- Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;
- Registering to vote without being entitled to register;
- Knowingly making a materially false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and
- Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

Acts of Coercion

- Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;
- Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;
- Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an election;
- Knowingly challenging a person's right to vote without probable cause or on fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or to delay the process of voting;
- As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election, or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or another of an employee's ballot;
- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;
- Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official's duty by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;
- Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and
- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in exchange for registering to vote.

Acts of Damage or Destruction

- Destroying completed voter registration applications;
- Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the voting booths or compartments;
- Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;

- Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is prevented from voting as the person intended;
- Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the election;
- Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and
- Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate, required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

Failure or Refusal to Act

- Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;
- Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election returns;
- Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts to do so;
- Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;
- Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;
- Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;
- Knowingly refusing to register a person who is entitled to register under the rules of that jurisdiction;
- Knowingly removing the eligibility status of a voter who is eligible to vote; and
- Knowingly refusing to allow an eligible voter to cast his/her ballot.

What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of “election crimes.” All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not “election crimes” for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not “election crimes,” even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not “election crimes.” Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not “election crimes.”

RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers (“DEOs”) and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, some of the articles contained information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. Additional media research should be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review

Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or suppression.

Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety of ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation. Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system. Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and “monitor field reports” from Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voting fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research

EAC should measure voting fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;

EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation, and concerns regarding how the observers themselves may inadvertently or deliberately influence the occurrence of election crimes.

Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud

Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit. Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” and the impact of the fraud.

Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons are noted as having voted.

Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such

practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.

Accepted Recommendations

There has never been a comprehensive, national study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.

In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes and the laws and procedures used to identify and prosecute them, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state's chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states' chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator

being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

CONCLUSION

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
12/01/2006 04:39 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gracia
Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, "Davidson, Donetta"
<ddavidson@eac.gov>, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc

Subject Draft Fraud/Intimidation Report with Executive Summary

Commissioners,

The draft attached below contains the Executive Summary as well as the suggestions made by Commissioner Hillman. Please let me know if you have any additional changes by COB Monday, Dec. 4, so that I can incorporate these and have this document ready for consideration at Thursday's meeting.



Voter Fraud & Intimidation Report - 120106.doc

In addition, I have had another request from Tova Wang for an embargoed copy of this report. I have not heard from any of you on this matter. I assume that this means that you agree with my opinion that we cannot release this document to her since she is no longer under contract with us, as it would be tantamount to releasing this document to the public. Please let me know ASAP if this is not your understanding and belief.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

014911

EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to study a host of topics, including “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” In 2005, EAC embarked on an initial review of the existing knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The goal of that study was to develop a working definition of “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” and to identify research methodology to conduct a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics.

EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes. It is clear from this review that there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud in elections as well as what constitute the most common acts of fraud or intimidation. There is also no apparent consensus on the meaning of the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities.

In order to facilitate future study of these topics, EAC developed a working definition of “election crimes.” “Election crimes” are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

From EAC’s review of existing information on the issue, it was apparent that there have been a number of studies that touched on various topics and regions of the country concerning voting fraud and intimidation, but that there had never been a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics. EAC will conduct further research to provide a comprehensive, nationwide look at “election crimes.” Future EAC study of this topic will focus on election-related, criminal activity and will not include acts that are exclusively civil wrongs, campaign finance violations, and violations of ethical provisions. EAC will study these concepts by surveying the states’ chief election officials about complaints they received through their administrative complaint processes, election crime investigation units regarding complaints received and those referred to law enforcement, and law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies regarding complaints received and charges filed.

INTRODUCTION

Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases familiar to many voting-aged Americans. However, they mean different things to different people. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are phrases used to refer to crimes, civil rights violations, and, at times, even the lawful application of state or federal laws to the voting process. Past study of these topics has been as varied as its perceived meaning. In an effort to help understand the realities of voting fraud and voter intimidation in our elections, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has begun this, phase one, of a comprehensive study on election crimes. In this phase of its examination, EAC has developed a working definition of election crimes and adopted research methodology on how to assess the existence and enforcement of election crimes in the United States.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EAC STUDY

Section 241 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) calls on the EAC to research and study various issues related to the administration of elections. During Fiscal Year 2006, EAC began projects to research several of the listed topics. These topics for research were chosen in consultation with the EAC Standards Board and Board of Advisors. Voting fraud and voter intimidation are topics that the EAC as well as its advisory boards felt were important to study to help improve the administration of elections for federal office.

EAC began this study with the intention of identifying a common understanding of voting fraud and voter intimidation and devising a plan for a comprehensive study of these issues. The initial study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of existing voting fraud and voter intimidation actions, laws, or prosecutions. To conduct that type of extensive research, a basic understanding had to first be established regarding what is commonly referred to as voting fraud and voter intimidation. Once that understanding was reached, a definition had to be crafted to refine and in some cases limit the scope of what reasonably can be researched and studied as evidence of voting fraud and voter intimidation. That definition will serve as the basis for recommending a plan for a comprehensive study of the area.

To accomplish these tasks, EAC employed two consultants, Job Serebrov and Tova Wang,¹ who worked with EAC staff and interns to conduct the research that forms the basis of this report. The consultants were chosen based upon their experience with the topic and the need to assure a bipartisan representation in this study. The consultants and EAC staff were charged with (1) researching the current state of information on the topic of voting fraud and voter intimidation; (2) developing a uniform definition of voting fraud and voter intimidation; and (3) proposing recommended strategies for researching this subject.

¹ Biographies for Job Serebrov and Tova Wang, the two consultants hired by EAC, are attached as Appendix "1".

EAC consultants reviewed existing studies, articles, reports and case law on voting fraud and intimidation and conducted interviews with experts in the field. EAC consultants and staff then presented their initial findings to a working group that provided feedback. The working group participants were:

The Honorable Todd Rokita
Indiana Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board and the
Executive Board of the Standards Board

Kathy Rogers
Georgia Director of Elections, Office of
the Secretary of State
Member, EAC Standards Board

J.R. Perez
Guadalupe County Elections
Administrator, Texas

Barbara Arnwine
Executive Director, Lawyers Committee
for Civil Rights under Law
Leader of Election Protection Coalition

Benjamin L. Ginsberg
Partner, Patton Boggs LLP
Counsel to National Republican
Campaign Committees and Republican
candidates

Robert Bauer
Chair of the Political Law Practice at the
law firm of Perkins Coie, District of
Columbia
National Counsel for Voter Protection,
Democratic National Committee

Mark (Thor) Hearne II
Partner-Member, Lathrop & Gage, St
Louis, Missouri
National Counsel to the American
Center for Voting Rights

Barry Weinberg
Former Deputy Chief and Acting Chief,
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division,
U.S. Department of Justice

Technical Advisor:

Craig Donsanto
Director, Election Crimes Branch, U.S.
Department of Justice

Throughout the process, EAC staff assisted the consultants by providing statutes and cases on this subject as well as supervision on the direction, scope and product of this research.

The consultants drafted a report for EAC that included their summaries of relevant cases, studies and reports on voting fraud and voter intimidation as well as summaries of the interviews that they conducted. The draft report also provided a definition of voting fraud and intimidation and made certain recommendations developed by the consultants or by the working group on how to pursue further study of this subject. This document was vetted and edited by EAC staff to produce this final report.

EXISTING INFORMATION ABOUT FRAUD AND INTIMIDATION

To begin our study of voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC consultants reviewed the current body of information on voting fraud and voter intimidation. The information available about these issues comes largely from a very limited body of reports, articles, and books. There are volumes of case law and statutes in the various states that also impact our understanding of what actions or inactions are legally considered fraud or intimidation. Last, there is anecdotal information available through media reports and interviews with persons who have administered elections, prosecuted fraud, and studied these problems. All of these resources were used by EAC consultants to provide an introductory look at the available knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Reports and Studies of Voting fraud and Intimidation

Over the years, there have been a number of studies conducted and reports published about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC reviewed many of these studies and reports to develop a base-line understanding of the information that is currently available about voting fraud and voter intimidation. EAC consultants reviewed the following articles, reports and books, summaries of which are available in Appendix “2”:

Articles and Reports

- People for the American Way and the NAACP, “The Long Shadow of Jim Crow,” December 6, 2004.
- Laughlin McDonald, “The New Poll Tax,” *The American Prospect* vol. 13 no. 23, December 30, 2002.
- Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau, “An Evaluation: Voter Registration Elections Board” Report 05-12, September, 2005.
- Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Attorney’s Office “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” May 10, 2005.
- National Commission on Federal Election Reform, “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” Center for Democracy and Election Management, American University, September 2005.
- The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, Commissioner and Law Professor at George Washington University School of Law “Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform,” September 19, 2005.

- Chandler Davidson, Tanya Dunlap, Gale Kenny, and Benjamin Wise, "Republican Ballot Security Programs: Vote Protection or Minority Vote Suppression – or Both?" A Report to the Center for Voting Rights & Protection, September, 2004.
- Alec Ewald, "A Crazy Quilt of Tiny Pieces: State and Local Administration of American Criminal Disenfranchisement Law," The Sentencing Project, November 2005.
- American Center for Voting Rights "Vote Fraud, Intimidation and Suppression in the 2004 Presidential Election," August 2, 2005.
- The Advancement Project, "America's Modern Poll Tax: How Structural Disenfranchisement Erodes Democracy" November 7, 2001
- The Brennan Center and Professor Michael McDonald "Analysis of the September 15, 2005 Voting fraud Report Submitted to the New Jersey Attorney General," The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, December 2005.
- Democratic National Committee, "Democracy at Risk: The November 2004 Election in Ohio," DNC Services Corporation, 2005
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2002."
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2003."
- Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2004."
- Craig Donsanto, "The Federal Crime of Election Fraud," Public Integrity Section, Department of Justice, prepared for Democracy.Ru, n.d., at http://www.democracy.ru/english/library/international/eng_1999-11.html
- People for the American Way, Election Protection 2004, Election Protection Coalition, at <http://www.electionprotection2004.org/edaynews.htm>
- Craig Donsanto, "Prosecution of Electoral Fraud under United State Federal Law," *IFES Political Finance White Paper Series*, IFES, 2006.

- General Accounting Office, "Elections: Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote," Report to Congressional Requesters, September 2005.
- Lori Minnite and David Callahan, "Securing the Vote: An Analysis of Election Fraud," Demos: A Network of Ideas and Action, 2003.
- People for the American Way, NAACP, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," December 2004.

Books

- John Fund, *Stealing Elections: How Voting fraud Threatens Our Democracy*, Encounter Books, 2004.
- Andrew Gumbel, *Steal this Vote: Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in American*, Nation Books, 2005.
- Tracy Campbell, *Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, An American Political Tradition – 1742-2004*, Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2005.
- David E. Johnson and Jonny R. Johnson, *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the White House: Foolhardiness, Folly, and Fraud in the Presidential Elections, from Andrew Jackson to George W. Bush*, Taylor Trade Publishing, 2004.
- Mark Crispin Miller, *Fooled Again*, Basic Books, 2005.

During our review of these documents, we learned a great deal about the type of research that has been conducted in the past concerning voting fraud and voter intimidation. None of the studies or reports was based on a comprehensive, nationwide study, survey or review of all allegations, prosecutions or convictions of state or federal crimes related to voting fraud or voter intimidation in the United States. Most reports focused on a limited number of case studies or instances of alleged voting fraud or voter intimidation. For example, "Shattering the Myth: An Initial Snapshot of Voter Disenfranchisement in the 2004 Elections," a report produced by the People for the American Way, focused exclusively on citizen reports of fraud or intimidation to the Election Protection program during the 2004 Presidential election. Similarly, reports produced annually by the Department of Justice, Public Integrity Division, deal exclusively with crimes reported to and prosecuted by the United States Attorneys and/or the Department of Justice through the Public Integrity Section.

It is also apparent from a review of these articles and books that there is no consensus on the pervasiveness of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Some reports, such as

“Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” suggest that there is little or no evidence of extensive fraud in U.S. elections or of multiple voting. This conflicts directly with other reports, such as the “Preliminary Findings of Joint Task Force Investigating Possible Election Fraud,” produced by the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office, FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office. That report cited evidence of more than 100 individual instances of suspected double-voting, voting in the name of persons who likely did not vote, and/or voting using a name believed to be fake.

Voter intimidation is also a topic of some debate because there is little agreement concerning what constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Some studies and reports cover only intimidation that involves physical or financial threats, while others cover non-criminal intimidation, including legal practices that allegedly cause vote suppression.

One point of agreement is that absentee voting and voter registration by nongovernmental groups create opportunities for fraud. For example, a number of studies cited circumstances in which voter registration drives have falsified voter registration applications or have destroyed voter registration applications of persons affiliated with a certain political party. Others conclude that paying persons per voter registration application creates the opportunity and perhaps the incentive for fraud.

Interviews with Experts

In addition to reviewing prior studies and reports on voting fraud and intimidation, EAC consultants interviewed a number of persons regarding their experiences and research of voting fraud and voter intimidation. Persons interviewed included:

Wade Henderson
Executive Director,
Leadership Conference for Civil Rights

Wendy Weiser
Deputy Director,
Democracy Program, The Brennan
Center

William Groth
Attorney for the plaintiffs in the Indiana
voter identification litigation

Lori Minnite
Barnard College, Columbia University

Neil Bradley
ACLU Voting Rights Project

Pat Rogers
Attorney, New Mexico

Nina Perales
Counsel,
Mexican American Legal Defense and
Education Fund

Rebecca Vigil-Giron
Secretary of State, New Mexico

Sarah Ball Johnson
Executive Director,
State Board of Elections, Kentucky

Stephen Ansolobhere
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Chandler Davidson
Rice University

Tracey Campbell

Author, *Deliver the Vote*

Douglas Webber

Assistant Attorney General, Indiana

Heather Dawn Thompson

Director of Government Relations,
National Congress of American Indians

Jason Torchinsky

Assistant General Counsel,
American Center for Voting Rights

Robin DeJarnette

Executive Director,
American Center for Voting Rights

Harry Van Sickle

Commissioner of Elections,
Pennsylvania

Tony Sirvello

Executive Director
International Association of Clerks,
Recorders, Election Officials and
Treasurers

Joseph Sandler

Counsel
Democratic National Committee

John Ravitz

Executive Director
New York City Board of Elections

Sharon Priest

Former Secretary of State, Arkansas

Kevin Kennedy

Executive Director
State Board of Elections, Wisconsin

Evelyn Stratton

Justice
Supreme Court of Ohio

Joseph Rich

Former Director
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Craig Donsanto

Director, Public Integrity Section
U.S. Department of Justice

John Tanner

Chief
Voting Section, Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice

These interviews in large part confirmed the conclusions that were gleaned from the articles, reports and books that were analyzed. For example, the interviewees largely agreed that absentee balloting is subject to the greatest proportion of fraudulent acts, followed by vote buying and voter registration fraud. They similarly pointed to voter registration drives by nongovernmental groups as a source of fraud, particularly when the workers are paid per registration. Many asserted that impersonation of voters is probably the least frequent type of fraud because it is the most likely type of fraud to be discovered, there are stiff penalties associated with this type of fraud, and it is an inefficient method of influencing an election.

Interviewees differed on what they believe constitutes actionable voter intimidation. Law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies tend to look to the criminal definitions of voter intimidation, which generally require some threat of physical or financial harm. On the other hand, voter rights advocates tended to point to activities such as challenger laws,

voter identification laws, polling place locations, and distribution of voting machines as activities that can constitute voter intimidation.

Those interviewed also expressed opinions on the enforcement of voting fraud and voter intimidation laws. States have varying authorities to enforce these laws. In some states, enforcement is left to the county or district attorney, and in others enforcement is managed by the state's attorney general. Regardless, voting fraud and voter intimidation are difficult to prove and require resources and time that many local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies do not have. Federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies have more time and resources but have limited jurisdiction and can only prosecute election crimes perpetrated in elections with a federal candidate on the ballot or perpetrated by a public official under the color of law. Those interviewed differed on the effectiveness of the current system of enforcement. Some allege that prosecutions are not sufficiently aggressive. Others feel that the current laws are sufficient for prosecuting fraud and intimidation.

A summary of the each of the interviews conducted is attached as Appendix "3".

Case Law and Statutes

Consultants reviewed more than 40,000 cases that were identified using a series of search terms related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The majority of these cases came from courts of appeal. This is not surprising, since most cases that are publicly reported come from courts of appeal. Very few cases that are decided at the district court level are reported for public review.

Very few of the identified cases were applicable to this study. Of those that were applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerged. However, it did seem that the greatest number of cases reported on fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility.

A listing of the cases reviewed in this study is attached as Appendix "4".

Media Reports

EAC consultants reviewed thousands of media reports concerning a wide variety of potential voting fraud or voter intimidation, including:

- absentee ballot fraud,
- voter registration fraud,
- voter intimidation and suppression,
- deceased voters on voter registration list and/or voting,
- multiple voting,
- felons voting,

- non-citizens voting,
- vote buying,
- deceptive practices, and
- fraud by election officials.

While these reports showed that there were a large number of allegations of voting fraud and voter intimidation, they provided much less information as to whether the allegations were ever formalized as complaints to law enforcement, whether charges were filed, whether prosecutions ensued, and whether any convictions were made. The media reports were enlightening as to the pervasiveness of complaints of fraud and intimidation throughout the country, the correlation between fraud allegations and the perception that the state was a “battleground” or “swing” state, and the fact that there were reports of almost all types of voting fraud and voter intimidation. However, these reports do not provide much data for analysis as to the number of complaints, charges and prosecutions of voting fraud and intimidation throughout the country.

DEFINITION OF ELECTION CRIMES

From our study of available information on voting fraud and voter intimidation, we have learned that these terms mean many things to many different people. These terms are used casually to refer to anything from vote buying to refusing to register a voter to falsifying voter registration applications. Upon further inspection, however, it is apparent that there is no common understanding or agreement of what constitutes “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation.” Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities. To arrive at a common definition and list of activities that can be studied, EAC assessed the appropriateness of the terminology that is currently in use and applied certain factors to limit the scope and reach of what can and will be studied by EAC in the future. As a result, EAC has adopted the use of the term “election crimes” for its future study.

Current Terminology

The phrase “voting fraud” is really a misnomer for a concept that is much broader. “Fraud” is a concept that connotes an intentional act of deception, which may constitute either a criminal act or civil tort depending upon the willfulness of the act.

Fraud, n. 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. • Fraud is usu[ally] a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.

Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 685.

“Voting” is the act of casting votes to decide an issue or contest. Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition, p. 1608. Using these terms to form a definition of “voting fraud,” it means fraudulent or deceptive acts committed to influence the act of voting.

Thus, a voter who intentionally impersonates another registered voter and attempts to vote for that person would be committing “voting fraud.” Similarly, a person who knowingly provides false information to a voter about the location of the voter’s polling place commits fraud on the voter.

The phrase “voting fraud” does not capture a myriad of other criminal acts that are related to elections which are not related to the act of voting and/or do not involve an act of deception. For example, “voting fraud” does not capture actions or willful inaction in the voter registration process. When an election official willfully and knowingly refuses to register to vote a legally eligible person it is a crime. This is a crime that involves neither the act of voting nor an act of deception.

To further complicate matters, the phrases “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” are used to refer to actions or inactions that are criminal as well as those that are potentially civil wrongs and even those that are legal. Obviously, criminal acts and civil wrongs are pursued in a very different manner. Criminal acts are prosecuted by the local, state or federal government. Generally, civil wrongs are prosecuted by the individual who believes that they were harmed. In some cases, when civil rights are involved, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice may become involved.

New Terminology

The goal of this study was to develop a common definition of what is generically referred to as “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” that would serve as the basis for a future, comprehensive study of the existence of these problems. Because the current terminology has such a variety of applications and meanings, “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation” can be read to encompass almost any bad act associated with an election. Such broad terminology is not useful in setting the boundaries of a future study. A definition must set parameters for future study by applying limitations on what is included in the concepts to be studied. The current terminology applies no such limitations.

Thus, EAC has adopted the use of the phrase “election crimes” to limit the scope of its future study. This term captures all crimes related to the voter registration and voting processes and excludes civil wrongs and non-election related crimes. EAC adopted this definition because it better represents the spectrum of activities that we are able to and desire to study. In addition, we recognize that the resources, both financial and human capital, needed to study all “voting fraud” and “voter intimidation,” including criminal acts, civil actions, as well as allegations of voter suppression through the use of legal election processes are well beyond the resources available to EAC. Finally, by limiting this definition to criminal acts, EAC can focus its study on a set of more readily measurable data. Criminal behavior is readily defined through state and federal statutes and is prosecuted by government agencies. This is not the case with civil matters. Civil actions can be prosecuted by individuals and/or government entities. Furthermore, what constitutes civil action is far less defined, subject to change, and can vary from case to

case. A more complete discussion of the concept of “election crimes” follows along with a list of excluded actions:

The Definition of an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

Election crimes are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

Election crimes can be committed by voters, candidates, election officials, or any other members of the public who desire to criminally impact the result of an election. However, crimes that are based upon intentional or willful failure to act assume that a duty to act exists. Election officials have affirmative duties to act with regard to elections. By and large, other groups and individuals do not have such duties.

The victim of an election crime can be a voter, a group of voters, an election official, a candidate, or the public in general. Election crimes can occur during any stage of the election process, including but not limited to qualification of candidates; voter registration; campaigning; voting system preparation and programming; voting either early, absentee, or on election day; vote tabulation; recounts; and recalls.

The following are examples of activities that may constitute election crimes. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but is representative of what states and the federal government consider criminal activity related to elections.

Acts of Deception

- Knowingly causing to be mailed or distributed, or knowingly mailing or distributing, literature that includes false information about the voter’s precinct or polling place, the date and time of the election or a candidate;
- Possessing an official ballot outside the voting location, unless the person is an election official or other person authorized by law or local ordinance to possess a ballot outside of the polling location;
- Making or knowingly possessing a counterfeit of an official election ballot;
- Signing a name other than his/her own to a petition proposing an initiative, referendum, recall, or nomination of a candidate for office;
- Knowingly signing more than once for the proposition, question, or candidate in one election;
- Signing a petition proposing an initiative or referendum when the signer is not a qualified voter.
- Voting or attempting to vote in the name of another person;
- Voting or attempting to vote more than once during the same election;

- Intentionally making a false affidavit, swearing falsely, or falsely affirming under an oath required by a statute regarding their voting status, including when registering to vote, requesting an absentee ballot or presenting to vote in person;
- Registering to vote without being entitled to register;
- Knowingly making a materially false statement on an application for voter registration or re-registration; and
- Voting or attempting to vote in an election after being disqualified or when the person knows that he/she is not eligible to vote.

Acts of Coercion

- Using, threatening to use, or causing to be used force, coercion, violence, restraint, or inflicting, threatening to inflict, or causing to be inflicted damage harm, or loss, upon or against another person to induce or compel that person to vote or refrain from voting or to register or refrain from registering to vote;
- Knowingly paying, offering to pay, or causing to be paid money or other thing of value to a person to vote or refrain from voting for a candidate or for or against an election proposition or question;
- Knowingly soliciting or encouraging a person who is not qualified to vote in an election;
- Knowingly challenging a person's right to vote without probable cause or on fraudulent grounds, or engaging in mass, indiscriminate, and groundless challenging of voters solely for the purpose of preventing voter from voting or to delay the process of voting;
- As an employer, attempting by coercion, intimidation, threats to discharge or to lessen the remuneration of an employee, to influence his/her vote in any election, or who requires or demands an examination or inspection by himself/herself or another of an employee's ballot;
- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other valuable thing in exchange for signing or refraining from signing a petition proposing an initiative;
- Inducing or attempting to induce an election official to fail in the official's duty by force, threat, intimidation, or offers of reward;
- Directly or through any other person advancing, paying, soliciting, or receiving or causing to be advanced, paid, solicited, or received, any money or other valuable consideration to or for the use of any person in order to induce a person not to become or to withdraw as a candidate for public office; and
- Soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to accept money or other thing of value in exchange for registering to vote.

Acts of Damage or Destruction

- Destroying completed voter registration applications;
- Removing or destroying any of the supplies or other conveniences placed in the voting booths or compartments;
- Removing, tearing down, or defacing election materials, instructions or ballots;

- Fraudulently altering or changing the vote of any elector, by which such elector is prevented from voting as the person intended;
- Knowingly removing, altering, defacing or covering any political sign of any candidate for public office for a prescribed period prior to and following the election;
- Intentionally changing, attempting to change, or causing to be changed an official election document including ballots, tallies, and returns; and
- Intentionally delaying, attempting to delay, or causing to be delayed the sending of certificate, register, ballots, or other materials whether original or duplicate, required to be sent by jurisdictional law.

Failure or Refusal to Act

- Intentionally failing to perform an election duty, or knowingly committing an unauthorized act with the intent to effect the election;
- Knowingly permitting, making, or attempting to make a false count of election returns;
- Intentionally concealing, withholding, or destroying election returns or attempts to do so;
- Marking a ballot by folding or physically altering the ballot so as to recognize the ballot at a later time;
- Attempting to learn or actually and unlawfully learning how a voter marked a ballot;
- Distributing or attempting to distribute election material knowing it to be fraudulent;
- Knowingly refusing to register a person who is entitled to register under the rules of that jurisdiction;
- Knowingly removing the eligibility status of a voter who is eligible to vote; and
- Knowingly refusing to allow an eligible voter to cast his/her ballot.

What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of “election crimes.” All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not “election crimes” for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not “election crimes,” even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate’s office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate’s office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not “election crimes.” Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not “election crimes.”

RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO STUDY ELECTION CRIMES

As a part of its study, EAC sought recommendations on ways that EAC can research the existence of election crimes. EAC consultants, the working groups and some of the persons interviewed as a part of this study provided the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Conduct More Interviews

Future activity in this area should include conducting additional interviews. In particular, more election officials from all levels of government, parts of the country, and political parties should be interviewed. It would also be especially beneficial to talk to law enforcement officials, specifically federal District Election Officers (“DEOs”) and local district attorneys, as well as civil and criminal defense attorneys.

Recommendation 2: Follow Up on Media Research

The media search conducted for this phase of the research was based on a list of search terms agreed upon by EAC consultants. Thousands of articles were reviewed and hundreds analyzed. Many of the articles contained allegations of fraud or intimidation. Similarly, some of the articles contained information about investigations into such activities or even charges brought. Additional media research should be conducted to determine what, if any, resolutions or further activity there was in each case.

Recommendation 3: Follow Up on Allegations Found in Literature Review

Many of the allegations made in the reports and books that were analyzed and summarized by EAC consultants were not substantiated and were certainly limited by the date of publication of those pieces. Despite this, such reports and books are frequently cited by various interested parties as evidence of fraud or intimidation. Further research should include follow up on the allegations discovered in the literature review.

Recommendation 4: Review Complaints Filed With “MyVote1” Voter Hotline

During the 2004 election and the statewide elections of 2005, the University of Pennsylvania led a consortium of groups and researchers in conducting the MyVote1 Project. This project involved using a toll-free voter hotline that voters could call for poll locations, be transferred to a local hotline, or leave a recorded message with a complaint. In 2004, this resulted in more than 200,000 calls received and more than 56,000 recorded complaints.

Further research should be conducted using the MyVote1 data with the cooperation of the project leaders. While perhaps not a fully scientific survey given the self-selection of the callers, the information regarding 56,000 complaints may provide insight into the problems voters may have experienced, especially issues regarding intimidation or suppression.

Recommendation 5: Further Review of Complaints Filed With U.S. Department of Justice

According to a recent GAO report, the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has a variety of ways it tracks complaints of voter intimidation. Attempts should be made to obtain relevant data, including the telephone logs of complaints and information from the Interactive Case Management (ICM) system. Further research should also include a review and analysis of the DOJ/OPM observer and “monitor field reports” from Election Day.

Recommendation 6: Review Reports Filed By District Election Officers

Further research should include a review of the reports that must be filed by every District Election Officer to the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The DEOs play a central role in receiving reports of voting fraud and investigating and pursuing them. Their reports back to the Department would likely provide tremendous insight into what actually transpired during the last several elections. Where necessary, information could be redacted or made confidential.

Recommendation 7: Attend Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium

Further activity in this area should include attending the next Ballot Access and Voting Integrity Symposium. At this conference, prosecutors serving as District Election Officers in the 94 U.S. Attorneys’ Offices obtain annual training on fighting election fraud and voting rights abuses. These conferences are sponsored by the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and feature presentations by Civil Rights officials and senior prosecutors from the Public Integrity Section and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices. By attending the symposium researchers could learn more about the following: how District Election Officers are trained; how information about previous election and voting issues is presented; and how the Voting Rights Act, the criminal laws governing election fraud and intimidation, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act are described and explained to participants.

Recommendation 8: Conduct Statistical Research

EAC should measure voting fraud and intimidation using interviews, focus groups, and a survey and statistical analysis of the results of these efforts. The sample should be based on the following factors:

- Ten locations that are geographically and demographically diverse where there have been many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;
- Ten locations (geographically and demographically diverse) that have not had many reports of fraud and/or intimidation;

EAC should also conduct a survey of elections officials, district attorneys, and district election officers. The survey sample should be large in order to be able to get the necessary subsets, and it must include a random set of counties where there have and have not been a large number of allegations.

Recommendation 9: Explore Improvements to Federal Law

Future researchers should review federal law to explore ways to make it easier to impose either civil or criminal penalties for acts of intimidation that do not necessarily involve racial animus and/or a physical or economic threat.

Recommendation 10: Use Observers to Collect Data on Election Day

Use observers to collect data regarding fraud and intimidation at the polls on Election Day. There may be some limitations to the ability to conduct this type of research, including difficulty gaining access to polling places for the purposes of observation, and concerns regarding how the observers themselves may inadvertently or deliberately influence the occurrence of election crimes.

Recommendation 11: Study Absentee Ballot Fraud

Because absentee ballot fraud constitutes a large portion of election crimes, a stand-alone study of absentee ballot fraud should be conducted. Researchers should look at actual cases to see how absentee ballot fraud schemes are conducted in an effort to provide recommendations on more effective measures for preventing fraud when absentee ballots are used.

Recommendation 12: Use Risk Analysis Methodology to Study Fraud

Conduct an analysis of what types of fraud people are most likely to commit. Researchers will use that risk analysis to rank the types of fraud based on the “ease of commission” and the impact of the fraud.

Recommendation 13: Conduct Research Using Database Comparisons

Researchers should compare information on databases to determine whether the voter rolls contain deceased persons and felons. In addition, the voter rolls can then be compared with the list of persons who voted to determine whether a vote was recorded by someone who is deceased or if felons are noted as having voted.

Recommendation 14: Conduct a Study of Deceptive Practices

The working group discussed the increasing use of deceptive practices, such as flyers and phone calls with false and/or intimidating information, to suppress voter participation. A number of groups, such as the Department of Justice, the EAC, and organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, keep phone logs regarding complaints of such

practices. These logs should be reviewed and analyzed to see how and where such practices are being conducted and what can be done about them.

Recommendation 15: Study Use of HAVA Administrative Complaint Procedure as Vehicle for Measuring Fraud and Intimidation

EAC should study the extent to which states are utilizing the administrative complaint procedure mandated by HAVA. In addition, the EAC should study whether data collected through the administrative complaint procedure can be used as another source of information for measuring fraud and intimidation.

Recommendation 16: Examine the Use of Special Election Courts

Given that many state and local judges are elected, it may be worth exploring whether special election courts should be established to handle fraud and intimidation complaints before, during, and after Election Day. Pennsylvania employs such a system and could investigate how well that system is working.

Accepted Recommendations

There has never been a comprehensive, national study that gathered data regarding all claims, charges, and prosecutions of voting crimes. EAC feels that a comprehensive study is the most important research that it can offer the election community and the public. As such, EAC has adopted all or a part of six of the 16 recommendations made by EAC consultants and the working group.

While several of the other recommendations could be used to obtain more anecdotal information regarding election crimes, EAC believes that what is needed is a comprehensive survey and study of the information available from investigatory agencies, prosecutorial bodies and courts on the number and types of complaints, charges and prosecutions of election crimes. Additional media reviews, additional interviews and the use of observers to collect information from voters on Election Day will only serve to continue the use of anecdotal data to report on election crimes. Hard data on complaints, charges and prosecutions exists and we should gather and use that data, rather than rely on the perceptions of the media or the members of the public as to what might be fraud or intimidation.

Some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of the current study. While election courts may be a reasonable conclusion to reach after we determine the volume and type of election crimes being reported, charged or prosecuted, it is premature to embark on an analysis of that solution without more information. Last, some of the recommendations do not support a comprehensive study of election crimes. While a risk analysis might be appropriate in a smaller scale study, EAC desires to conduct a broader survey to avoid the existing problem of anecdotal and limited scope of information.

In order to further its goal of developing a comprehensive data set regarding election crimes and the laws and procedures used to identify and prosecute them, EAC intends to engage in the following research activities in studying the existence and enforcement of election crimes:

Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state's chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states' chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.

Survey State Election Crime Investigation Units Regarding Complaints Filed and Referred

Several chief state election officials have developed investigation units focused on receiving, investigating, and referring complaints of election crimes. These units were established to bolster the abilities of state and local law enforcement to investigate allegations of election crimes. California, New York and Florida are just three examples of states that have these types of units.

EAC will use a survey instrument to gather information on the numbers and types of complaints that have been received by, investigated, and ultimately referred to local or state law enforcement by election crime investigation units since January 1, 2004. These data will help us understand the pervasiveness of perceived fraud, as well as the number of claims that state election officials felt were meritorious of being referred to local and state law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies for further action.

Survey Law Enforcement and Prosecutorial Agencies Regarding Complaints and Charge of Voting Crimes

While voters, candidates and citizens may call national hotlines or the news media to report allegations of election crimes, it is those complaints that are made to law enforcement that can be investigated and ultimately prosecuted. Thus, it is critical to the study of election crimes to obtain statistics regarding the number and types of complaints that are made to law enforcement, how many of those complaints result in the perpetrator

being charged or indicted, and how many of those charges or indictments result in pleas or convictions.

Thus, EAC will survey law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies at the local, state and federal level to determine the number and types of complaints, charges or indictments, and pleas or convictions of election crimes since January 1, 2004. In addition, EAC will seek to obtain an understanding of why some complaints are not charged or indicted and why some charges or indictments are not prosecuted.

Analyze Survey Data in Light of State Laws and Procedures

Once a reliable data set concerning the existence and enforcement of election crimes is assembled, a real analysis of the effectiveness of fraud prevention measures can be conducted. For example, data can be analyzed to determine if criminal activities related to elections are isolated to certain areas or regions of the country. Data collected from the election official surveys can be compared to the data regarding complaints, charges and prosecutions gathered from the respective law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies in each jurisdiction. The effect and/or effectiveness of provisions such as voter identification laws and challenger provisions can be assessed based on hard data from areas where these laws exist. Last, analyses such as the effectiveness of enforcement can be conducted in light of the resources available to the effort.

CONCLUSION

Election crimes are nothing new to our election process. The pervasiveness of these crimes and the fervor with which they have been enforced has created a great deal of debate among academics, election officials, and voters. Past studies of these issues have been limited in scope and some have been riddled with bias. These are issues that deserve comprehensive and nonpartisan review. EAC, through its clearinghouse role, will collect and analyze data on election crimes throughout the country. These data not only will tell us what types of election crimes are committed and where fraud exists, but also inform us of what factors impact the existence, prevention, and prosecution of election crimes.

APPENDIX 1 – BIOGRAPHIES OF JOB SEREBROV AND TOVA WANG

Available on EAC Website, www.eac.gov.

APPENDIX 2 – SUMMARIES OF BOOKS, REPORTS AND ARTICLES

Available on EAC Website, www.eac.gov.

APPENDIX 3 – SUMMARIES OF INTERVIEWS

Available on EAC Website, www.eac.gov.

APPENDIX 4 – SUMMARIES OF CASES REVIEWED

Available on EAC Website, www.eac.gov.



Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV

12/04/2006 12:52 PM

To Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc pdegregorio@eac.gov, Ddavidson@eac.gov, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

bcc

Subject Fraud Report Executive Summary

Attached are my suggested edits to the Executive Summary. (I am still reviewing the report and may comment on other sections.)



EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY.doc

014933

EAC REPORT ON VOTING FRAUD AND VOTER INTIMIDATION STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) requires the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to study a host of topics, including "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation." In 2005, EAC embarked on an initial review of the existing knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The goal of that study was to develop a working definition of "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation" and to identify research methodology to conduct a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics.

EAC staff along with two, bipartisan consultants reviewed the existing information available about voting fraud and voter intimidation, including reading articles, books and reports; interviewing subject matter experts; reviewing media reports of fraud and intimidation; and studying reported cases of prosecutions of these types of crimes. It is clear from this review that there is a great deal of debate on the pervasiveness of fraud in elections as well as what constitute the most common acts of fraud or intimidation. There is also no apparent consensus on the meaning of the phrases "voting fraud" and "voter intimidation." Some think of voting fraud and voter intimidation only as criminal acts, while others include actions that may constitute civil wrongs, civil rights violations, and even legal activities.

In order to facilitate future study of these topics, EAC developed a working definition of "election crimes." "Election crimes" are intentional acts or willful failures to act, prohibited by state or federal law, that are designed to cause ineligible persons to participate in the election process; eligible persons to be excluded from the election process; ineligible votes to be cast in an election; eligible votes not to be cast or counted; or other interference with or invalidation of election results. Election crimes generally fall into one of four categories: acts of deception, acts of coercion, acts of damage or destruction, and failures or refusals to act.

From EAC's review of existing information on the issue, it was apparent that there have been a number of studies that touched on various topics and regions of the country concerning voting fraud and intimidation, but that there had never been a comprehensive, nationwide study of these topics. EAC will conduct further research to provide a comprehensive, nationwide look at "election crimes." Future EAC study of this topic will focus on election-related, criminal activity and will not include acts that are exclusively civil wrongs, campaign finance violations, and violations of ethical provisions. EAC will study these concepts by surveying the states' chief election officials about complaints they received, election crime investigation units regarding complaints received and those referred to law enforcement, and law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies regarding complaints received, charges filed, and final disposition of each complaint.

Comment [GH1]: Ethical provisions of what?

Comment [GH2]: We should learn about all complaints received by election officials, not just those received through the admin complaint process.

Deleted: through their administrative complaint processes

Comment [GH3]: Our study should also include final disposition of each case where charges were filed.

Deleted: and



Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV

12/04/2006 01:49 PM

To Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc pdegregorio@eac.gov, Ddavidson@eac.gov, Thomas R.
Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC

bcc

Subject Edits to the Fraud Report

I offer edits to two sections of the report, on pages 14 and 19. Please see the attached one pager. I did a copy and paste of the two sections rather than resending back to you the entire report.



What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study.doc

014935

What is not an Election Crime for Purposes of this Study

There are some actions or inactions that may constitute crimes or civil wrongs that we do not include in our definition of "election crimes." All criminal or civil violations related to campaign finance contribution limitations, prohibitions, and reporting either at the state or federal level are not "election crimes" for purposes of this study and any future study conducted by EAC. Similarly, criminal acts that are unrelated to elections, voting, or voter registration are not "election crimes," even when those offenses occur in a polling place, voter registration office, or a candidate's office or appearance. For example, an assault or battery that results from a fight in a polling place or at a candidate's office is not an election crime. Last, violations of ethical provisions and the Hatch Act are not "election crimes." Similarly, civil or other wrongs that do not rise to the level of criminal activity (i.e., a misdemeanor, relative felony or felony) are not "election crimes."

.....

Comment [GH1]: Ethical provisions of what?


Survey Chief Election Officers Regarding Administrative Complaints

Likely sources of complaints concerning election crimes are the administrative complaint processes that states were required to establish to comply with Section 402 of HAVA. These complaint procedures were required to be in place prior to a state receiving any funds under HAVA. Citizens are permitted to file complaints alleging violations of HAVA Title III provisions under these procedures with the state's chief election official. Those complaints must be resolved within 60 days. The procedures also allow for alternative dispute resolution of claims. Some states have expanded this process to include complaints of other violations, such as election crimes.

In order to determine how many of these complaints allege the commission of election crimes, EAC will survey the states' chief election officers regarding complaints that have been filed, investigated, and resolved since January 1, 2004. The data collected will also include complaints that have been filed outside of the administrative complaint procedures. EAC will use the definition of election crimes provided above in this report in its survey so that data regarding a uniform set of offenses will be collected.


Comment [GH2]: We can be pretty certain that legitimate complaints will be filed outside of the Admin Complaint Procedure.

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
12/04/2006 01:49 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Fraud report 

I assume that you saw Gracia's comments. I accepted them and added one or two words to clarify one point.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV




Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
12/04/2006 01:42 PM

To Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV
cc
Subject Fraud report

Julie,
I looked over your changes and they look fine with me. I'll trust your judgement on the final product we receive on Thursday. If any policy or major changes are made by other commissioners, let me know.
Thanks.
Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

014937



Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

10/18/2005 04:56 PM

To Juliet Thompson, Thomas R. Wilkey (EAC)

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Research Grants

I am not sure you received this e-mail from Hans (it wasn't clear on the to: list).

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

— Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 10/18/2005 04:56 PM —



"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov"

<Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>

10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To "gmhillman@eac.gov" <gmhillman@eac.gov>,
"rmartinez@eac.gov" <rmartinez@eac.gov>,
"pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>,
"eac.gov" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>,
"ddavison@eac.gov" <ddavison@eac.gov>
cc "christophert@michigan.gov"
<christophert@michigan.gov>

Subject Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and

014938

continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor of the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.


Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice

014939

950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839

014940



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
10/18/2005 05:17 PM

To "Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov"
<Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>@GSAEXTERNAL
cc
bcc Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV
Subject Re: Research Grants

Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Heame called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov" <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>



"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov"
<Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
j.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To "gmhillman@eac.gov" <gmhillman@eac.gov>,
"rmartinez@eac.gov" <rmartinez@eac.gov>,
"pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>,
"eac.gov" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>,
"ddavison@eac.gov" <ddavison@eac.gov>
cc "christophert@michigan.gov"

014941



<christophert@michigan.gov>

<lewis@electioncenter.org>

<lewis@electioncenter.org>

Subject Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor of the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters."

014942

Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839

014943

Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV
10/18/2005 06:26 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Research Grants

Yes Ray has already called him to remind him that TWO people are working on the project and he obviously didn't finish reading the entire sentence in the Electionline report

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Paul DeGregorio

From: Paul DeGregorio
Sent: 10/18/2005 04:56 PM
To: Juliet Thompson; Thomas Wilkey
Subject: Fw: Research Grants

I am not sure you received this e-mail from Hans (it wasn't clear on the to: list).

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

— Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 10/18/2005 04:56 PM —



"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov"
<Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To "gmhillman@eac.gov" <gmhillman@eac.gov>,
"rmartinez@eac.gov" <rmartinez@eac.gov>,
"pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>,
"eac.gov" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>,
"ddavison@eac.gov" <ddavison@eac.gov>
cc "christophert@michigan.gov" <christophert@michigan.gov>
<[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>
<dlewis@electioncenter.org>
<[REDACTED]>
Subject Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated

014944

pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor of the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict


014945

exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839

014946



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
10/25/2005 05:07 PM

To Karen Lynn-Dyson
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Research Grants

see e-mail traffic below

— Forwarded by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV on 10/25/2005 05:07 PM —



"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj
.gov"
<Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdo
j.gov>
10/19/2005 09:49 AM

To "pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>
cc
Subject RE: Research Grants

perhaps if the Board of Advisors were kept better informed, I would not have been put into this position.

-----Original Message-----

From: pdegregorio@eac.gov [mailto:pdegregorio@eac.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 5:18 PM
To: von Spakovsky, Hans (CRT)
Subject: Re: Research Grants
Importance: High

Hans,

I wish you would have shown us the decency to have spoken to someone at the EAC before you sent this e-mail. Had you done so, you might have discovered that Ms. Wang was paired with Job Serebrov, a conservative attorney who, like you, has served on a local election board (Washington, Co, AK -Fayetteville). He has also worked on voting issues and election law in his practice, including voter fraud. He was counsel to the Arkansas GOP on ballot integrity issues and was the ballot protection specialist for Mike Huckabee in his campaign for Lt. Governor. In addition, Job formed and ran "Arkansans for Fair Elections", a non-partisan group that looked to investigate and prevent voter fraud issues. He headed that group for 8 years. Job served the Republican Party of Arkansas as the Chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the State Constitution.

Thor Hearne called me last week to indicate that Job had called him to be on the working group that Job and Ms. Wang are putting together to look at the voter fraud/voter intimidation issues.

Job was recommended to the EAC for this work by Julie Thompson. His references included two US 8th Circuit judges appointed by GOP presidents: Morris Arnold and Lavenski Smith.

You may recall that the Advisory Board made it clear to the EAC that they thought the Voter Fraud/Voter Intimidation issues should be studied together. That's why Ms. Wang has been paired with Mr. Serebrov to do this study.

014947

Julie tells me that she had a wide-ranging discussion with you last week but you never brought this issue up. It's too bad, as it may have prevented you from sending an e-mail to so many people that contains only half the story.

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

"Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov" <Hans.von.Spakovsky@usdoj.gov>
10/18/2005 03:45 PM

To

"gmhillman@eac.gov" <gmhillman@eac.gov>, "rmartinez@eac.gov"
<rmartinez@eac.gov>, "pdegregorio@eac.gov" <pdegregorio@eac.gov>,
"eac.gov" <jthompson@eac.gov/twilke>, "ddavison@eac.gov"
<ddavison@eac.gov>

cc

"christophert@michigan.gov" <christophert@michigan.gov>,
"
"dewis@electioncenter.org" <dewis@electioncenter.org>
[REDACTED]

Subject

Research Grants

Dear Commissioners:

On August 18 I sent you an email raising serious concerns over the awarding of a contract to the Moritz College of Law given its clearly demonstrated pre-existing opinions about provisional balloting and voter identification. Unfortunately, nothing was apparently done about this situation.

I have just learned that a similar situation has occurred. I understand that another research grant has been awarded to Tova Wang for research into "voter fraud and voter intimidation." Ms. Wang has an even more pronounced partisan and one-sided view of these issues than was present in the situation involving Moritz College. She has many posted opinions available on the Internet that make it clear that she will not be able to conduct research in an objective fashion on these issues. Just a few examples illustrate this:

014948

"It is truly shocking how, given all the problems in the voting system and continued disenfranchisement, the terms of the debate have shifted to that of so-called 'ballot integrity.' It is reminiscent of how conservatives have misappropriated the concept of patriotism and the American flag, and used the power of language and messaging to distort the discussion, by using terms such as 'partial birth abortion' or death tax.'"

"This stands in stark contrast to the entire tenor of the Carter-Baker report, which presumes that fraud committed by voters is the biggest problem confronting our election system. There is simply no strong evidence of this, and some of the remedies proposed will take us backwards in the fight to increase voter participation."

"...voters are individually disenfranchised by continued, often race based, voter intimidation and deceptive practices..."

Carter-Baker Report: Some Bad Fixes for the Wrong Problem, 9/19/2005

"The data is also mounting that identification requirements have disproportionately disenfranchising impacts on certain communities...Given all this piling on of negative evidence, both in terms of the efficacy of ID requirements in fulfilling the goal their advocate's claim and their impact on voting rights, it is somewhat mind boggling that so many state officials, as well as other groups working on this issue, are still vigorously pushing for greater expansion of what seems to be a rather useless yet dangerous tool. Shouldn't the burden of proof now shift to the advocates of more voter ID to demonstrate the value of their cause?"

Voter ID and Fraud: Prove It, 7/28/2005

There are numerous more examples of her partisan opinions and attacks and demonstrably false claims against Republicans and election officials in general, such as her baseless charge in another article that "partisan election officials and party leaders usurped the process and manipulated the new federal voting law in ways that disenfranchised voters." Election 2004: A Report Card, 1/1/2005. The idea that she will write an objective report on issues that she has already expressed such strong opinions on ("there is no evidence that such election fraud is a serious problem") is hard to accept. I find it surprising that the EAC would award her a research grant or expect that election officials around the country would accept as valid a report written by an individual who asserts that "[a]t every step of the way, election officials in key states threw up unnecessary barriers to voting." Id. This gratuitous remark is an insult to the many hard-working election officials that we all know through our work who did everything they could during the last election to improve the election process and in large part succeeded.

Whatever procedures the EAC has set up to screen individuals and entities applying for research grants is obviously not working. I have no doubt that I could today, based on reading Ms. Wang's prior opinions, predict exactly what her report will conclude on the issues of voter fraud and voter intimidation. This situation needs to be corrected so that research is not being conducted by partisan individuals with preset opinions and views on issues. As with my prior email, I strongly recommend that the EAC reconsider the awarding of this contract.

Hans A. von Spakovsky
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General

014949


Civil Rights Division - Room 5539
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone (202) 305-9750
Facsimile (202) 307-2839

014950



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
10/17/2006 10:14 AM

To: Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject: Re: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter 

The letter is fine with me.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeannie Layson
Sent: 10/17/2006 10:06 AM
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson
Cc: Thomas Wilkey; Margaret Sims; Karen Lynn-Dyson; Juliet Hodgkins; Gavin Gilmour; Bryan Whitener
Subject: NEED APPROVAL: Brennen Cen. letter

Commissioners,

I have not received input from everyone regarding the attached letter. It is a response to Wendy Weiser of the Brennan Center, who requested the staff voter fraud status report and the provisional voting draft report, both of which were presented to the Standards Bd. and the Bd. of Adv. at the May meeting. She also requested the draft voter ID report, which was not released at the May meeting. If possible, I'd like to get your input by the end of the day. The letter would go out under Tom's signature. Thank you.

Jeannie Layson
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-566-3100
www.eac.gov

014951



Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV

11/04/2005 11:42 AM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

bcc

Subject Tally Vote - Tova Wang contract



Tova Wang resume.pdf



Communication of Award - EAC 05-66.pdf



EAC 05-66 Voting Fraud & Voter Intimidation Contract Info.pdf



Memo for the record - EAC 05-66.pdf



SOW EAC 05-66 Voting Fraud & Voter Intimidation.pdf



Tally Vote - Vote Fraud & Voter Intimidation 9.16.05.pdf



Tally vote cover - Tova Wang.pdf



Tally Vote Memo - Tova Wang.pdf

Amie J. Sherrill
Special Assistant to Vice Chairman Paul S. DeGregorio
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566 3106

014952

Tova Andrea Wang



BAR ADMISSION: New York

EDUCATION

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, New York, N.Y.
J.D., May, 1996

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, New York, N.Y.
B.A. in Political Science, *magna cum laude*, May, 1991; GPA: 3.8

EXPERIENCE

THE CENTURY FOUNDATION, New York, N.Y.

Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow: March, 2001 – Present

Research, write, and publish reports, provide commentary to national and state press, provide expertise to policymakers, give expert testimony and speak before groups around the country on election reform and voting rights, in addition to other civil liberties issues. Currently serve as the Executive Director of The Century Foundation's Post-2004 Election Reform Working Group, comprised of preeminent election law scholars from across the country. Served as staff person to the National Commission on Federal Election Reform, co-chaired by former Presidents Carter and Ford, of which The Century Foundation was a co-sponsor.

THE KAMBER GROUP, New York, N.Y.

Deputy Director of Public Policy: August, 1998 – March, 2001

Formulated and drafted public policy ideas, provided policy research and analysis, and provided general strategic political consulting services to non-governmental organizations, political campaigns, elected officials and grassroots organizations. Conducted lobbying and public advocacy campaigns.

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC ADVOCATE, Investigation Into Police Misconduct, New York, N.Y.

Deputy Director and Director of Policy: January, 1999 – July, 2000

Conducted all policy analysis and research, including evaluating programs and policies of the NYPD and police departments across the world. Developed policy proposals, conducted briefings, and wrote reports. Helped manage collection of quantitative and qualitative data, expert interviews, hearings, budgeting and fundraising.

INDEPENDENT POLICY/POLITICAL CONSULTANT: August, 1996 – August, 1998,
New York and Washington, D.C.

Advised on policy, politics, legislation, and public relations for Reverend Jesse Jackson, the Children's Defense Fund, and the Academy of Political Science.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, New York, N.Y.

Assistant to the Editor-in-Chief, Theodor Meron: September, 1995 - May, 1996

Researched, edited and assisted in writing articles and speeches on current issues in international human rights law.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Executive Office for Immigration Review, New York, N.Y.

Legal Intern: June - August, 1995

Researched and wrote immigration court decisions in political asylum, deportation and exclusion cases.

CLINTON FOR PRESIDENT CAMPAIGN, New York, N.Y.

Manhattan Field Director: February - July, 1992

Coordinated all campaign field operations in Manhattan. Negotiated the support of elected officials and political

014953

leaders; conducted outreach to community organizations; mobilized and managed activities of 1000 volunteers.

ACTIVITIES/ASSOCIATIONS

Member, Election Law Committee, Association of the Bar of the City of New York

Member, State Affairs Committee, Citizens Union of New York

Member, Make Votes Count Committee, Citizens Union of New York

Founding member, American Constitution Society – New York

014954



**U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005**

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Date: November 1, 2005

From: Karen Lynn Dyson

Re: Communication of Award of Contracts EAC 05-66 and EAC 05-67, Personal Services Contracts with Tova Wang and Job Serebrov

In late August and early September 2005 a series of emails and phone calls were exchanged with Job Serebrov and Tova Wang in order to communicate the details of personal services contracts that were awarded to them. The substance of these e-mails and phone calls related to Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang's contracts, described the various services they would perform for EAC related to researching and possibly developing a future project that would study and analyze voting fraud and intimidation. These emails included transmitting a statement of work that would govern their work as well as emails and phone calls to establish a kick-off meeting that would provide information to them so that Mr. Serebrov and Ms. Wang could begin work.

Since that time, Ms. Wang and Mr. Serebrov have engaged in substantial work on this project. This has included developing, outlining and providing to EAC staff, a work plan for the project, meeting and conversing with one another to discuss the focus and work of the project, interviewing prospective persons who would serve on the project's review panel and presenting this initial list of persons to the EAC to be considered as members of this project review panel who would assess and review the project's work.

014955

**EAC CONTRACT #05-66 Consulting Services to Assist EAC
in the Development of a Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project**

Background

Section 241 of HAVA lists a number of election administration topics on which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to do research. In particular, Section 241(b) (6) and (7) state the two topics of nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in elections for Federal offices; and identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation. The EAC Board of Advisors has recommended that the EAC make research on these topics a high priority.

The EAC seeks to obtain consulting services from an individual who can provide advice drawn from broad professional and technical experience in the area of voter fraud and intimidation. The EAC needs this consultant to conduct a preliminary examination of these topics to determine if a larger research project might be warranted. If so, the consultant would also be tasked to define the scope of the project and prepare a Statement of Work for the EAC to use for a subsequent competitive procurement. To promote a balanced and non-partisan approach to this effort, EAC is contracting with two consultants, who will work jointly to perform the work described below.

Nature of the Appointment

The EAC enters into this contract pursuant to its authority to contract for consultants under 5 U.S.C. §3109 (See 42 U.S.C. §15324(b)). As such this contract is for personal services and creates a limited employment relationship. (See 5 C.F.R. §304). As a result of this unique relationship, and pursuant to this agreement, you are required to follow all Federal laws and regulations as they relate to the release of agency documents and information, travel and conduct. All research, information, documents and any other intellectual property, (including but not limited to policies, procedures, manuals, and other work created at the request or otherwise while laboring for the EAC) shall be owned exclusively by the EAC, including copyright. All such work product shall be turned over to the EAC upon completion of your appointment term or as directed by the EAC. The EAC shall have exclusive rights over this material. You may not release government information or documents without the express permission of the EAC.

Supervision and Management.

The EAC Project Manager for this effort is Margaret Sims, EAC Research Specialist. Ms. Sims will provide taskings, and supervise, review and approve all work and performance.

Period of Appointment, Compensation and Travel.

The period of appointment under this contract is estimated at six months. The appointment shall constitute intermittent appointment (without a regularly scheduled tour of duty) per 5 C.F.R. §340.401(b). The consultant shall not incur overtime. The consultants shall not receive automatic adjustments of pay based upon 5 U.S.C. 5303. The consultants are not eligible for sick and annual leave, nor compensation for work performed on federal holidays. The Consultant is expected to work 450 hours during the estimated six month appointment period. These hours must be distributed evenly over the period so that the Consultant is working approximately, but no more than 20 hours per week. The consultant shall be paid at a rate of \$111 per hour. The dates of performance are flexible but shall be based upon the needs of the project and the EAC. The project at issue is sought to be completed within the sixth month period. The period of appointment shall continue until the project, outlined below, is completed.

Consultant's duty station shall be his/her home or place of business. The consultant has access to and shall supply common office equipment to include telecommunications, internet, a computer, office supplies, facsimile machine and common workplace software (including Microsoft Word and Excel). Other resources will be provided by the EAC as needed and at its discretion.

The Consultant is required to travel on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of their appointment. All travel must be pre-approved by the EAC per Federal Travel Regulations and EAC policy. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, proper incidental expenses, and per diem while on official, pre-approved EAC travel.

Areas of Responsibility

1. Develop a comprehensive description of what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation in the context of Federal elections.
2. Using the description developed above, perform background research, including both Federal and State administrative and case law review, and a summation of current activities of key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations regarding these topics. Deliver a written summary of this research and all source documentation.
3. Work in consultation with other EAC staff and the Commissioners to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The Working Group will be provided with the results of the consultant's research (discussed in 1 and 2, above) as background information. The consultant will be responsible for developing a discussion agenda and convene the Working Group with the objective of identifying promising avenues for future research by EAC.

4. The consultant shall be responsible for creating a report summarizing the findings of this preliminary research effort and Working Group deliberations. This report should include any recommendations for future research resulting from this effort.
5. Should the EAC decide to pursue one or more of the recommendations made in the report noted above, the consultant will be responsible for defining the appropriate project scope(s) and preparing Statement(s) of Work sufficient for use in a competitive procurement.

Compensation Procedures

Compensation shall be made for work done by submitting invoices. Invoices shall be submitted on a monthly basis. These invoices shall state the number of labor hours that have been expended. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Margaret Sims for review and Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005. Compensation for travel shall be submitted by travel voucher consistent with federal travel regulation and EAC requirements.

Termination

This consultant contract can be terminated without cause in advance of the current end date by two weeks' notice in writing by either of the parties.

Estimated Project Timetable.

Deliverable	Due Date
Project work plan	10 days after contract award
Progress reports	monthly
Description of voting fraud and voter intimidation	October 2005
Summary of background research and associated source documentation	January 2006
Convene working group	February 2006
Summary report describing findings and recommendations for future EAC research	March 2006
Statement(s) of Work for future research project(s)	TBD



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Date:

From: Gracia Hillman, Chair
On Behalf of the Commission

Re: Ratification of Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang (EAC Contract No. 05-66; ACT No. E4019697)

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the ratification of the above referenced agreement. Ratification is the process proscribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to approve, by an official with the authority to do so, an agreement that was not binding on an agency because the Government representative who made it lacked authority to enter into the agreement on behalf of the government (unauthorized commitment). (FAR 1.602-3(a)).

Background. Information was brought to the attention of the Commission late in the week of October 10. This information suggested that communication of award for the above referenced agreement may not have been made by an individual with authority to bind the government. As such, the agreement may be viewed as an unauthorized commitment. The above referenced personal services agreement was to assist EAC in researching and developing a Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project. This was needed by the Commission in order to fulfill its research responsibilities under Sections 241(b)(6) and (7) of HAVA.

The Commission has considered Ms. Wang's qualifications and found her to be experienced in matters involving voter fraud and intimidation. (Attachment "1", Resume) In addition, the Commission has agreed to a six-month period of performance, from September 2005 through February 2006. (Attachment "2", Statement of Work). An award was made by full vote of the EAC Commissioners on September 19, 2005 (Attachment "3", Tally Vote Certification and Memorandum). The award was announced by the Commission on the record at a public meeting on September 27, 2005.

Prior to the time that the formal award was made by vote of the Commission, award was communicated by an EAC employee through a series of telephone calls and emails in early September 2005. (Attachment "4", Statement from Karen Lynn Dyson). Work began on the contract following award notification. This was evidenced by a kickoff meeting between EAC employees and the contractor which took place on September 7, 2005. Also, the contractor provided services in meeting with the other contractor engaged to provide similar assistance, developing a work plan for the voter fraud and intimidation project, interviewing and considering members to serve as a review panel for the work of the consultants on this project, and

014959

developing a preliminary list of panelists. (Attachment "4", Statement of Karen Lynn Dyson). Ultimately, ratification of this agreement will result in the Commission receiving all of the deliverables identified in the contract.

Funding was available in fiscal year 2005 (FY 05) for the services at issue. And, it appears based upon a review of the law that funding this contract from FY05 funds would be proper. These FY 05 funds remain available. The funds were in fact obligated to the agreement, in the amount of \$50,000.00 on September 21, 2005. This was done under the belief that a legal obligation had been created. The agreement approved for award by the Commissioners had a total estimated cost of \$50,000.00.

Requirements. FAR 1.602-3 (b) and (c) set federal ratification policy and requirements. These sections note:

- (1) Agencies should take action to prevent the need for ratification actions. Ratification procedures should not be used in a manner that encourages unauthorized commitments being made by government personnel. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(1)).
- (2) The head of an agency's contracting activity, unless the authority is designated higher, may ratify an unauthorized agreement. This authority may be delegated with limitations. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(2) & (3)).
- (3) Agencies should process unauthorized commitments consistent with FAR 1.602-3. Such actions should not be forwarded to the General Accounting Office for resolution unless they are subject to a Contracts Dispute Act Claim or are not otherwise ratifiable under the subsection. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(4)-(5) & (d)).
- (4) Consistent with FAR 1.602-3(c)(1)-(7), ratification authority may be exercised only when:
 - a. *Supplies or services have been provided to and accepted by the Government, or the Government otherwise has obtained or will obtain a benefit resulting from performance of the unauthorized commitment;*
 - b. *The ratifying official has the authority to enter into a contractual commitment;*
 - c. *The resulting contract would otherwise have been proper if made by an appropriate contracting officer;*
 - d. *The contracting officer reviewing the unauthorized commitment determines the price to be fair and reasonable;*
 - e. *The contracting officer recommends payment and legal counsel concurs in the recommendation, unless agency procedures expressly do not require such concurrence; and*
 - f. *Funds are available and were available at the time the unauthorized commitment was made.*

Analysis. The commitment at issue began as a routine contracting effort. EAC, unlike many government agencies, has the express statutory authorization to enter into personal services contracts under 5 U.S.C. Section 3109. That authority is provided by the Help America Vote Act

Section 204(b). Section 3109 and the regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management concerning personal services contracts allows these contracts only where a specific statute authorizes it and where it meets the terms as specified in the statute and regulation for type of appointment and rate of pay. The agreement with Ms. Wang appoints her in an intermittent capacity and establishes a rate of \$111 per hour, a rate which falls within the limits prescribed by 5 CFR Part 304.105.

In reviewing the fiscal law, it appears that the type of the contract is not dispositive as to whether the services provided by that contract are severable and must be funded in the fiscal year in which the services are rendered. While personal services contracts are generally considered severable (and payable in the fiscal year the work is performed), there must be an analysis of the nature of the work performed under the contract. The GAO Red Book, Vol. I sites one case which notes that legal administrative services were considered severable where there was no final report or final product produced from the contractual agreement. Another, case determined that substantive legal services procured from attorney's was non-severable. Thus, appears to be a distinction made between perennial, clerical work and substantive, project-based work. In the instant case, the consultant is providing project associated services that will result in a final report and final product in the form of a report and an RFP for a future study of voter fraud and voter intimidation.

Issues regarding the agreement's unauthorized nature arose near the end of the award process. While the contract authority (Commissioners) properly took action to make an award determination, they relied on EAC employees to communicate this fact to the contractor. In doing so, the Commission failed to realize that it is the communication of acceptance and award by the appropriate person that serves to obligate the government. EAC personnel seem to have viewed the Commissioners' concurrence as granting them the authority to communicate award in a manner that would obligate the agency. The bottom line is that the EAC employee believed her efforts to notify the contractor of award obligated the EAC by accepting the contractor's proposal. Based upon this, the contractor began performance on the agreement and the EAC has and will receive benefit.

Looking specifically at the requirements for ratification noted in FAR 1.602-3(c) and the facts outlined, above, the Commission finds:

- a. Services Accepted or Benefit Received. Services under this agreement have been accepted by the government. Moreover the government has and will obtain needed benefit from the services provided and upon completion of the unauthorized agreement.
- b. Contract Authority. The undersigned, as the chair of the EAC, has the authority to contract on behalf of the agency. Furthermore, the Chair's signature represents the decision of the full Commission to take this ratification action. This is documented by the attached Tally Vote. (Attachment "5", Tally Vote). EAC's four Commissioners have the legal authority to contract and otherwise bind the agency per the specific authority of the Help America Vote Act (42 U.S.C. §15325(e)) and, generally, as agency heads (see FAR 1.601).

- c. Contract Otherwise Proper. This agreement, having previously been initiated, processed, and awarded by full vote of the Commission was proper, but for the unauthorized communication of award made by an individual without authority to bind the agency. As stated previously, EAC is specifically authorized by statute to enter into personal services contracts. HAVA Section 204(b). This agreement falls within the statute and regulations governing personal services contracts. See specifically 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 5 CFR Part 304.
- d. Price Fair and Reasonable. The rate at which this contractor is providing services is within the amount allowable under 5 CFR Part 304.105. In addition, the contractor works regularly as Senior Program Officer and Democracy Fellow for The Century Foundation. The rate provided is commensurate with her regular rate for consulting services.
- e. Payment of Funds Recommended. After consultation with the General Counsel, the Commission recommends payment of funds.
- f. Funds Available. Consistent with the facts noted above, the Commission finds that funds are available and were available at the time of the unauthorized commitment.

Prevention. Unfortunately, there are a number of agreements which have suffered from the same deficiencies as discussed above. FAR 1.602(b)(1) makes it clear that agencies should take steps to prevent the need for ratifications and avoid using the process in a way that would encourage unauthorized commitments. The EAC must determine why these unauthorized commitments occurred and how to prevent them in the future. An initial review of EAC's contract process showed deficiencies in (1) the contracting procedure, (2) training of employees on contracting process and procedure, (3) coordination with the General Counsel's office, and (4) communication amongst contracting officers and staff that resulted in an unauthorized commitment. No new contracting should occur until issues surrounding the process have been resolved. EAC is in the process of negotiating with another government agency to handle its procurement process, thereby relieving the EAC staff of the responsibility of processing these procurements.

Gracia Hillman
Chair
On Behalf of the Commission

I Concur.

Juliet Thompson
General Counsel

014962

Statement of Work

Assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

Section 241 of HAVA enumerates a number of periodic studies of election administration issues in which the U.S. Election Assistance Commission may elect to engage. In general "On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)"

Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

(6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.

(7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues to determine how the EAC might respond to them is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) seeks to identify one or more senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

The consultant(s) must of have knowledge of voting fraud and voter intimidation along with an understanding of the complexities, nuances and challenges which surround the topics. The EAC is particularly interested in candidates with experience in elections, with public policy and with the law. The consultant (s) must be able to demonstrate an ability to approach the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation in a balanced, nonpartisan fashion.

Duties

The consultant(s), whose contract would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for the following.

1. Identifying what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.
2. Performing background research, including Federal and state-by state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, and a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations. A written summary of this research, and a copy of any source documentation used, will be presented to EAC.
3. Identifying, in consultation with EAC, and convening a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The working group's goals and objectives and meeting agendas will be vetted with key EAC staff.
4. Developing a project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation. The consultants (s) will develop a draft scope of work and project work plan for EAC's consideration based on research into the topics, the deliberations and findings of the working group, and the consultants' understanding of EAC's mission and agency objectives.
5. Authoring a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation. The report will also include suggestions for specific activities that EAC may undertake to address these topics.

From this initial research and exploration of these topics the consultant (s) may be retained to help oversee follow-on research projects and contracts EAC may pursue on the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Special Considerations

Work for Hire. The services performed under the terms of this agreement are considered "work for hire," and any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to, research, policies, procedures, manuals, and other works submitted; or which are specified to be delivered; or which are developed or produced and paid for by EAC, shall be owned exclusively by EAC, including copyright. EAC or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all work products from this agreement without further payment to the Contractor.

Terms and Conditions

The period of performance for this consulting contract is six months, with a fixed price ceiling of \$50,000 for labor. The consultant (s) is expected to work at least 450 hours in performing this work. The EAC estimates that the most efficient distribution of these hours would be for the consultant to work 20 hours per week. The period of performance and level of effort can be revised in writing by mutual agreement of the EAC and the consultant, as required.

The Consultant is required to travel to the EAC Washington, D.C. offices on a periodic, as needed basis, throughout the duration of the contract. The Consultant will be reimbursed, at the Federal government rates, for hotel and ground transportation costs, other approved incidental expenses, and per diem costs while working on-site at the EAC offices. A fixed price ceiling of \$5,000 has been allocated for reimbursement for travel and other allowable expenses.

Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted monthly in equal payments for labor. Expenses claimed for reimbursement shall be itemized with appropriate receipts provided. Invoices shall be delivered to Ms. Diana Scott, Administrative Officer, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, 1225 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington DC 20005.

Deliverables and Timetable

Deliverable	Due Date
Draft project work plan (Phase I)	ASAP after award
Progress Reports to Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)	Monthly
A written summary of background research on voting fraud and voter intimidation.	TBD
Identifying and convening a working group knowledgeable about voting fraud and voter intimidation.	TBD
Developing a project scope of work and project work plan (Phase II)	TBD
Summary report describing key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation	TBD

014965



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

- () I approve the recommendation.
() I disapprove of the recommendation.
() I object to the recommendation.
() I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _____

DATE: _____ SIGNATURE: _____

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.


FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

014966



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MEMORANDUM

TO: EAC Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez, Davidson
FROM:  Thomas Wilkey, EAC Executive Director
DATE: September 16, 2005
RE: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Background

"On such periodic basis as the Commission may determine, the Commission shall conduct and make available to the public studies regarding the election administration issues described in subsection (b)" Sections 241(b) (6) and (7) list the following election administration issues:

- (6) Nationwide statistics and methods of identifying, deterring and investigating voting fraud in election for Federal offices.
- (7) Identifying, deterring and investigating methods of voter intimidation.

Building on this HAVA reference to studies of voting fraud and voter intimidation, the EAC Board of Advisors has indicated that further study of these issues, to determine how the EAC might respond to them, is a high priority.

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has identified two senior-level project consultants to develop various project activities and studies related to voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections. The consultants, whose contracts would run for the period September-February, 2005, would be responsible for helping the EAC identify what constitutes voting fraud and voter intimidation affecting Federal elections.

To accomplish this the consultants will: perform background research, including Federal and state-by state administrative and case law review related to voting fraud and voter intimidation, along with a review of current voting fraud and voter intimidation activities taking place with key government agencies, civic and advocacy organizations; in consultation with EAC, identify and convene, a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation; develop an EAC project scope of work and a project work plan related to voting fraud and voter intimidation and; author a report summarizing the key findings of this preliminary study of voting fraud and voter intimidation.

Recommendation

Attached is the Statement of Work for the voting fraud and voter intimidation project consultants. The consultant contract fees total \$110,000 (\$55,000 per person). An additional \$10,000 is allotted for the voting fraud and intimidation project working group. The total project amount is \$120,000.

014967



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

- () I approve the recommendation.
() I disapprove of the recommendation.
() I object to the recommendation.
() I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _____

DATE: 9-16-05

SIGNATURE: Donetta Davidson

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 

014968



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

- ☒ I approve the recommendation.
☐ I disapprove of the recommendation.
☐ I object to the recommendation.
☐ I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _____

DATE: 9/16/05

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

[Signature]

014969



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005. 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005. 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

- ☒ I approve the recommendation.
- ☐ I disapprove of the recommendation.
- ☐ I object to the recommendation.
- ☐ I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _____

DATE: September 18, 2005 SIGNATURE: Paul S DeGregorio
signed by Amir Shariif

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

014970



Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV

09/18/2005 04:38 PM

To Amie J. Sherrill/EAC/GOV

cc Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV, Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV,
Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV, Carol A. Paquette/EAC/GOV

bcc

Subject Tally Votes

This is to authorize my Special Assistant, Amie Sherrill, to mark on my behalf the following Tally Votes regarding the awarding of contracts, as approving the staff recommendation for each of the following:

1. RFP #05-04 to the University of Florida Levin College of Law for the development of legal resources clearinghouse
2. RFP #05-07 to the Center for Public Policy and Administration of the University of Utah for the development of best practices on vote count and recount procedures
3. RFP #05-11 to Zimmerman Associates, Inc for the development of records management policies and procedures
4. ~~Sole Source contracts to Job Serebry and Nava Wang in developing a EAC Young Guard and Voter Education Project~~
5. Sole Source contract to the National Academies of Science for Technical Support for Statewide Registration Database Implementation with Online Forums for Discussion

Paul DeGregorio
Vice Chairman
US Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
1-866-747-1471 toll-free
202-566-3100
202-566-3127 (FAX)
pdegregorio@eac.gov
www.eac.gov

014871



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: September 16, 2005, 3:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: September 20, 2005, 3:00PM

COMMISSIONERS: HILLMAN, DEGREGORIO, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Consulting assistance with developing an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Voting Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

- ☒ I approve the recommendation.
- ☐ I disapprove of the recommendation.
- ☐ I object to the recommendation.
- ☐ I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: _____

DATE: 9-17-05

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to DeAnna Smith. Please return the ballot no later than the date and time shown above.

FROM THOMAS R. WILKEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR [Signature]

014972



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

TALLY VOTE MATTER

DATE & TIME OF TRANSMITTAL: November 3, 2005, 5:00PM

BALLOT DEADLINE: November 7, 2005, 5:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS: DeGREGORIO, HILLMAN, MARTINEZ, DAVIDSON

SUBJECT: Ratification of Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang
(EAC 05-66).

- () I approve the recommendation.
() I disapprove the recommendation.
() I object to the recommendation.
() I am recused from voting.

COMMENTS: See the attached memo in support.

DATE: _____ SIGNATURE: _____

A definite vote is required. All ballots must be signed and dated. Please return ONLY THE BALLOT to the Benita Fundersburg. Please return the ballot no later than date and time shown above.

FROM JULIET THOMPSON, GENERAL COUNSEL

014973



U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Ave. NW - Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioners Hillman, DeGregorio, Martinez and Davidson

FROM: Juliet Thompson

DATE: November 1, 2005

RE: **Personal Services Contract with Tova Wang (EAC Contract No. 05-66; ACT No. E4019697)**

BACKGROUND:

On or about October 7, 2005, the Chair of the EAC requested that the Office of General Counsel review 19 contracts for procurement of goods and services. As a part of the review, we examined contract file documents and spoke with EAC staff and representatives involved in each stage of the contracting process.

In reviewing the contract with Ms. Tova Wang to provide services in researching and developing a voter fraud and intimidation project for EAC, we determined that the agreement had been entered through a legally permissible process, that a vote was taken by the Commission to award this agreement, that the award was communicated by an EAC staff member to Ms. Wang, work has begun under the agreement, and that EAC has and will receive a benefit from the provision of these services by Ms. Wang. The review revealed that the commitment was made by a person who was not the contracting officer of EAC and who was not authorized to make such commitment. Therefore, this agreement was made by a person who did not have the authority to bind the Commission. Because the contract was otherwise proper and EAC has and will continue to receive benefits from the completion of this contract, the agreement and facts surrounding it fit within the framework for ratification set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

Ratification is the process proscribed by the FAR to approve, by an official with the authority to do so, an agreement that was not binding on an agency because the Government representative who made it lacked authority to enter into the agreement on behalf of the government (unauthorized commitment). (FAR 1.602-3(a)).

REQUIREMENTS FOR RATIFICATION:

FAR 1.602-3 (b) and (c) set federal ratification policy and requirements. These sections note:

- (1) Agencies should take action to prevent the need for ratification actions. Ratification procedures should not be used in a manner that encourages unauthorized commitments being made by government personnel. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(1)).
- (2) The head of an agency's contracting activity, unless the authority is designated higher, may ratify an unauthorized agreement. This authority may be delegated with limitations. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(2) & (3)).
- (3) Agencies should process unauthorized commitments consistent with FAR 1.602-3. Such actions should not be forwarded to the General Accounting Office for resolution unless they are subject to a Contracts Dispute Act Claim or are not otherwise ratifiable under the subsection. (FAR 1.602-3(b)(4)-(5) & (d)).
- (4) Consistent with FAR 1.602-3(c)(1)-(7), ratification authority may be exercised only when:
 - a. *Supplies or services have been provided to and accepted by the Government, or the Government otherwise has obtained or will obtain a benefit resulting from performance of the unauthorized commitment;*
 - b. *The ratifying official has the authority to enter into a contractual commitment;*
 - c. *The resulting contract would otherwise have been proper if made by an appropriate contracting officer;*
 - d. *The contracting officer reviewing the unauthorized commitment determines the price to be fair and reasonable;*
 - e. *The contracting officer recommends payment and legal counsel concurs in the recommendation, unless agency procedures expressly do not require such concurrence; and*
 - f. *Funds are available and were available at the time the unauthorized commitment was made.*

ANALYSIS:

The commitment at issue began as a routine contracting effort. EAC, unlike many government agencies, has the express statutory authorization to enter into personal services contracts under 5 U.S.C. Section 3109. That authority is provided by the Help America Vote Act Section 204(b). Section 3109 and Office of Personnel Management regulations implementing the statute allow personal services contracts only when they meet the terms specified in the statute and regulation for type of appointment and rate of pay. The agreement with Mr. Serebrov properly appoints him in an intermittent capacity and establishes a rate of \$111 per hour, a rate which falls within the limits prescribed by 5 CFR Part 304.105.

In reviewing the fiscal law, it appears that the type of the contract is not dispositive as to whether the services provided by that contract are severable and must be funded in the fiscal year in

which the services are rendered. While personal services contracts are generally considered severable (and payable in the fiscal year the work is performed), there must be an analysis of the nature of the work performed under the contract. The GAO Red Book, Vol. I sites one case which notes that legal administrative services were considered severable where there was no final report or final product produced from the contractual agreement. Another, case determined that substantive legal services procured from attorney's was non-severable. Thus, appears to be a distinction made between perennial, clerical work and substantive, project-based work. In the instant case, the consultant is providing project associated services that will result in a final report and final product in the form of a report and an RFP for a future study of voter fraud and voter intimidation.

Issues regarding the agreement's unauthorized nature arose near the end of the award process. While the contract authority (Commissioners) properly took action to make an award determination, they relied on EAC employees to communicate this fact to the contractor. In doing so, the Commission failed to realize that it is the communication of acceptance and award by the appropriate person that serves to obligate the government. EAC personnel seem to have viewed the Commissioners' concurrence as granting them the authority to communicate award in a manner that would obligate the agency. The bottom line is that the EAC employee believed her efforts to notify the contractor of award obligated the EAC by accepting the contractor's proposal. Based upon this, the contractor began performance on the agreement and the EAC has and will receive benefit.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (1) Review the contract, contract materials and statements of persons involved in the contracting process;
- (2) Ratify the contract by voting affirmatively to take such action;
- (3) Authorize the Chair on behalf of the Commission, with concurrence by the General Counsel, to document such ratification through a memorandum for the record to become a permanent part of the contract file on this contract;
- (4) Execute the contract and transmit the signed contract to the contractor.



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
11/17/2005 10:18 AM

To Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: RESPONSE REQUESTED-Working Group for Voting
Fraud and Voter Intimidation Project

Fyi.
Any recommendations?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----
From: Margaret Sims
Sent: 11/16/2005 01:12 PM
To: Gracia Hillman; Paul DeGregorio; Raymundo Martinez;
donetta.davidson@sos.state.co.us
Cc: Sheila Banks; Amie Sherrill; Adam Ambrogi; Elieen Collver; Gavin Gilmour
Subject: RESPONSE REQUESTED-Working Group for Voting Fraud and Voter
Intimidation Project

Dear Commissioners:

The consultants' contracts for EAC's voting fraud and voter intimidation project require Tova Wang and Job Serebrov to work in consultation with EAC staff and the Commissioners "to identify a working group of key individuals and representatives of organizations knowledgeable about the topics of voting fraud and voter intimidation". The contracts do not specify the number of working group members but, as EAC has to pay for the group's travel and we want the size of the group to be manageable, I recommend that we limit the number to 6 or 8. Please let me know if you think that this limit is too conservative .

Attached for your review and comment are two lists of potential working group members for this project. One list was submitted by Job, the other by Tova. Tova and Job have provided brief summaries of each candidate's relevant experience and have placed asterisks next to the names of the individuals whom they particularly recommend. I can provide more extensive biographies of these individuals, if you need them. If EAC agrees that the recommended working group members are acceptable, an equal number may be selected from each list in order to maintain a balanced perspective.

Absent from the attached lists is the name of a representative from the U.S. Department of Justice's Election Crimes Branch. At this time, I am working through the DOJ bureaucracy to determine to what degree Craig Donsanto will be permitted to participate. If he cannot be named as a working group member, we may still be able to use him as a resource.

Please provide your feedback to me no later than Monday , November 28. I am available to meet with you if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Peggy Sims
Research Specialist

014877



Possible Working Group Members -Serebrov.doc



Possible Working Group Members- Wang.doc

Possible Working Group Members - Serebrov

I recommend the first four with an *

***Mark (Thor) Hearne II**-Counsel to Republican National Committee; National Counsel to American Center for Voting Rights; National election counsel to Bush-Cheney, '04; Testified before U.S. House Administration Committee hearings into conduct of Ohio presidential election; Academic Advisor to Commission on Federal Election Reform (Baker-Carter Commission).

***Todd Rokita**-Secretary of State, Indiana; Secretary Rokita strives to reform Indiana's election practices to ensure Indiana's elections are as fair, accurate and accessible as possible; Secretary Rokita serves on the nine-member Executive Board of the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board, charged by federal law to address election reform issues.

***Patrick J. Rogers**-Partner/Shareholder, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris and Sisk, P.A., Albuquerque, New Mexico; 1991-2003 General Counsel to the New Mexico Republican Party; Election cases: *The Coalition to Expose Ballot Deception, et al v. Judy N. Chavez, et al*; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); represented plaintiffs challenging petition procedures; *Miguel Gomez v. Ken Sanchez and Judy Chaves*; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2005); residency challenge; *Moises Griego, et al v. Rebecca Vigil-Giron v. Ralph Nader and Peter Miguel Camejo*, Supreme Court for the State of New Mexico (2004); represented Ralph Nader and Peter Camejo, ballot access issues; *Larry Larrañaga, et al v. Mary E. Herrera and Rebecca Vigil-Giron*, Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; *Decker, et al v. Kunko, et al*; District Court of Chaves County, New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; *Kunko, et al v. Decker, et al*; Supreme Court of New Mexico (2004); voter identification and fraudulent registration issues; *In the Matter of the Security of Ballots Cast in Bernalillo County in the 2000 General Election*; Second Judicial District Court of Bernalillo County, New Mexico (2000); voting and counting irregularities and fraud.

***David A. Norcross**- Partner, Blank Rome LLP, Trenton NJ, Washington D.C; Chairman, New Jersey Republican State Committee, 1977 – 1981; General Counsel, Republican National Committee, 1993 – 1997; General Counsel, International Republican Institute; Counsel, The Center for Democracy; Vice Chairman, Commission on Presidential Debates; Executive Director, New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission

Benjamin L. Ginsberg-Served as national counsel to the Bush-Cheney presidential campaign; He played a central role in the 2000 Florida recount; He also represents the campaigns and leadership PACs of numerous members of the Senate and House, as well as the Republican National Committee, National Republican Senatorial Committee and

National Republican Congressional Committee; His expertise is more in campaign finance.

Cleta Mitchell-Partner in the Washington, D.C. office of Foley & Lardner LLP; She advises corporations, nonprofit organizations, candidates, campaigns, and individuals on state and federal election and campaign finance law, and compliance issues related to lobbying, ethics and financial disclosure; Ms. Mitchell practices before the Federal Election Commission and similar federal and state enforcement agencies; Her expertise is more in campaign finance law.

Mark Braden-Of counsel at Baker & Hostetler; He concentrates his work principally on election law and governmental affairs, including work with Congress, the Federal Election Commission, state campaign finance agencies, public integrity issues, political broadcast regulation, contests, recounts, the Voting Rights Act, initiatives, referendums and redistricting; His expertise is mainly outside of the voter fraud area.

To: Peggy Sims
From: Tova Wang
Re: Working Group Recommendations
Date: November 12, 2005

*Wendy R. Weiser, Associate Counsel in the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and an expert in federal and constitutional law, has done a great deal of research, writing, speaking, and litigating on voting rights and election law issues. As part of the Brennan Center's wide ranging activities in the area of democracy, Ms. Weiser is currently overseeing an analysis and investigation of recent allegations of voter fraud throughout the country.

*Barbara Arnwine is Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, an organization that for four decades has been at the forefront of the legal struggle to secure racial justice and equal access to the electoral process for all voters. Notably, Ms. Arnwine and the organization have led the Election Protection program for the last several years, a nationwide grassroots education and legal effort deploying thousands of volunteers and using a nationally recognized voter hotline to protect voters' rights on election day.

*Daniel Tokaji, professor and associate director of the Election Law Center at the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University, is one of the nation's foremost experts in election law and reform and ensuring equality in the voting system. Professor Tokaji frequently writes and speaks on democracy related issues at academic and practitioner conferences, on such issues as voting technology, fraud, registration, and identification requirements, as well as the interplay between the election administration practices and voting rights laws.

Donna Brazile is Chair of the Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights Institute, the Democratic Party's major initiative to promote and protect the right to vote created in response to the irregularities of the 2000 election, and former Campaign Manager for Gore-Lieberman 2000 (the first African American to lead a major presidential campaign.) Brazile is a weekly contributor and political commentator on CNN's Inside Politics and American Morning, a columnist for Roll Call Newspaper and a contributing writer for Ms. Magazine.

Wade Henderson is the Executive Director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) and Counsel to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF), an organization at the forefront of defending voting rights for the last fifty years. Prior to his role with the Leadership Conference, Mr. Henderson was the Washington Bureau Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)


Robert Bauer is the Chair of the Political Law Practice at the law firm of Perkins Coie, National Counsel for Voter Protection, Democratic National Committee, Counsel to the Democratic Senatorial and Congressional Campaign Committees and Co-Author, Report

of Counsel to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee in the Matter of the United States Senate Seat from Louisiana in the 105th Congress of the United States, (March 27, 1997). He is the author of *United States Federal Election Law*, and one of the foremost attorneys in the country in the area of federal/state campaign finance and election laws.

Laughlin McDonald has been the executive director of the Southern Regional Office of the ACLU since 1972 and as the Director of the ACLU Voting Rights Project, McDonald has played a leading role eradicating discriminatory election practices and protecting the gains in political participation won by racial minorities since passage of the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act. During the past two decades, McDonald has broken new ground by expanding ACLU voting rights cases to include representation of Native Americans in various western states, and written innumerable publications on voting rights issues.

Joseph E. Sandler is a member of the firm of Sandler, Reiff & Young, P.C., in Washington, D.C., concentrating in campaign finance and election law matters, and general counsel to the Democratic National Committee. As an attorney he has handled campaign finance and election law matters for Democratic national and state party organizations, Members of Congress, candidates and campaigns. He served as general co-counsel of the Association of State Democratic Chairs, as general counsel for the Democratic Governors' Association and as counsel to several state Democratic parties.

Cathy Cox is serving her second term as Georgia's Secretary of State, having first been elected in 1998. In 2002 she earned re-election with over 61 percent of the vote, winning 146 out of 159 counties. Because of Secretary Cox's efforts Georgia has become a national leader in election reform. Her initiative made Georgia the first state in America to deploy a modern, uniform electronic voting system in every county



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV

09/28/2006 09:09 PM

To Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Speech on Fraud intimidation Sept 29 06 Salt Lake City



Thanks. I actually sent you an earlier version by mistake. That paragraph. (and a few others) have been improved. You are right about Tova. I'll say the consultants' report is undergoing staff review.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins

Sent: 09/28/2006 08:52 PM

To: Paul DeGregorio

Subject: Re: Speech on Fraud intimidation Sept 29 06 Salt Lake City

Paul,

Two comments:

1) There is a sentence on page 2 that doesn't make sense. I have copied the text below.

. While others consider any form of ineligible voter as fraud.

2) I am pretty sure that we have received the final product from our voter fraud/intimidation contractors. However, that product is pending staff review. So, if Tova is in the audience and she likely will be, she may challenge the statement in the speech that we await their report.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

-----Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV wrote: -----

To: Juliet E. Thompson/EAC/GOV, Jeannie Layson/EAC/GOV
From: Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV
Date: 09/28/2006 05:10PM

014983

Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
12/08/2006 04:38 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC, Gracia Hillman/EAC/GOV@EAC, "Davidson, Donetta" <ddavidson@eac.gov>, Thomas R. Wilkey/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc Bert A. Benavides/EAC/GOV@EAC, Sheila A. Banks/EAC/GOV@EAC, Elieen L. Collver/EAC/GOV@EAC, Matthew Masterson/EAC/GOV@EAC, jlayson@eac.gov
bcc

Subject Draft response to Tova Wang

History

 This message has been replied to

Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.



draft response to Tova Wang.doc

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

014984

December 8, 2006

Ms. Tova Wang
(Address)
(Address)

Dear Ms. Wang:

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission believes that voting fraud and voter intimidation are very important, complex topics that should be studied and reported on fairly and accurately. As a clearinghouse of election administration information, EAC is committed to providing complete and comprehensive information to the election community and the public.

In its December 2006 report on voting fraud and voter intimidation, EAC honored this commitment by providing the readers of its report with the full and complete summaries of every interview conducted as well as every book, article, report or case that was reviewed. It is incumbent upon us to provide them with the best and most complete data and research that we can. Rather than provide only the synopsis of these interviews, EAC provided the readers with the entire summaries created by the consultants so readers could reach their own conclusions about the substance of the interviews.

With regard to the interviews of two of the personnel from the Department of Justice, EAC made clarifying edits. Upon reviewing initial information about their interviews contained in the status report provided to the EAC Standards Board and EAC Board of Advisors and the information provided by the consultants at the working group meeting, those persons interviewed did not agree with certain characterizations of their statements contained in these materials. The Department of Justice is an important prosecutorial agency engaged in enforcing Federal anti-fraud and anti-intimidation laws. Thus, it was important to EAC to assure that the summary of their comments did not lend confusion to an already complex and hotly-debated topic.

Because of the lack of organization and cohesion in the draft provided by the consultants, that document would have led to greater confusion and division regarding the issues of voting fraud and voter intimidation. As such, EAC revised the draft report and provided the entirety of the supporting documentation to the public.

For these reasons, the report on voting fraud and voter intimidation will stand as adopted on December 7, 2006.

014985


Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV
12/08/2006 05:37 PM

To Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Draft response to Tova Wang

History: This message has been replied to

I can certainly do that. I was focusing on trying to use her own words against her.

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel
United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100
Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV



Paul DeGregorio /EAC/GOV
12/08/2006 05:29 PM

To Juliet E. Hodgkins/EAC/GOV@EAC
cc
Subject Re: Draft response to Tova Wang

Julie,

The letter is good, but don't you want to point out that in every report we issue that the research provided by paid consultants/organizations is provided under contract to the EAC, who by law is ultimately responsible for any final report issued to the public. And that such reports always takes into consideration the research provided but the EAC is obligated to consider all factors when making determinations to insure fairness and integrity of the process.

Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Juliet E. Hodgkins
----- Original Message -----

From: Juliet E. Hodgkins
Sent: 12/08/2006 04:38 PM
To: Paul DeGregorio; Gracia Hillman; Donetta Davidson; Thomas Wilkey
Cc: Bert Benavides; Sheila Banks; Elieen Collver; Matthew Masterson;
Jeannie Layson
Subject: Draft response to Tova Wang

Commissioners,

Jeannie and I have collaborated on the following draft response to Tova Wang's letter. Please let me know if you agree or have comments/edits.

[attachment "draft response to Tova Wang.doc" deleted by Paul DeGregorio/EAC/GOV]

Juliet Thompson Hodgkins
General Counsel

014986

United States Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Ave., NW, Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3100

014987